

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXVI, 1.

WHOLE NO. 101.

I.—THE COLLEGIUM POETARUM AT ROME.

Among the many reminders of the continuity of human culture in the city of Rome no insignificant place may be claimed by the guilds and corporations, many of which still have their official abode on the Capitol itself, such as the Università dei Albergatori¹ and others whose specific names I cannot readily recall at this distance of time. As a matter of fact this Italian expression has faithfully preserved the technical term current in the ancient Roman Civil Law. There indeed it has for synonymous companions *collegium* and *corpus*,² as e. g. in Gaius, Digest, 3, 4, 1. In the latter passage we read of the corporate treasury, the *arca*, and the president or executive member. The corporation is conceived as a miniature commonwealth, and was probably so viewed in a legal sense. Gaius says: "Quibus autem permissum est corpus habere collegii societatis sive cuiusque alterius eorum nomine, proprium est ad exemplum reipublicae habere res communes, arcam communem et actorem sive syndicum per quem tamquam in re publica, quod communiter agi fierique oporteat, agatur fiat". And it is just this chronological segment of imperial history, just this age of Gaius of Berytus, that furnishes in the main Orelli-Henzen with the multitude of epigraphical data, by which this particular feature of Roman social life is fully illumined and exemplified. But in Henzen's Index X (*Collegia Sacra, Publica, Privata*, p. 170 sqq.)—Liebenam has but two pages, viz., 64–65, on

¹ Cf. the *Collegium tabernaculariorum*, Orelli-Henzen, 6101.

² Thus too in Th. Mommsen: *De Collegiis et Sodalicis*, 1843, p. 37. Cf. Liebenam's monograph, *Römisches Vereinswesen*, 1890.

the Republican era—we look in vain for some guild or club analogous or comparable to the Collegium Poetarum of the republican era.¹ There is an exhaustive enumeration of the Collegia in Rome by Kornemann in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. *collegium*; but one does not expect in a cyclopaedia a detailed essay on the Collegium Poetarum, however significant and important a body it might have been in the history of the earlier stages of Roman letters. Lucian Müller has something to say on the Collegium Poetarum in his Quintus Ennius, Eine Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie, St. Petersburg, 1884, p. 30 sqq., but after a close examination I am still convinced that not all the ore has been extracted from this bed.

The *hymnus* in honor of Juno Regina² (which Livius of Tarentum composed in the anxious and critical time before Hasdrubal's defeat at Sena, 207 B. C.) is called by the historian Livy 27, 37 "laudabile rudibus ingeniis, nunc abhorrens et inconditum, si referatur"—words which seem to suggest that the hymn actually existed in Livy's time. A reproduction of course would have called for some form of accompanying music. But supposing this *carmen* existed in Livy's time, where was it preserved? Perhaps among the *acta* of some sacerdotal corporation, perhaps among the family records of the Livii Salinatores,³ perhaps in the Palatine Library, perhaps in the Collegium Poetarum. Verrius Flaccus probably had no direct knowledge of this *hymnus*. As for the historian Livy, his ear was hardly more inclined to favor Archaic Latin than that of his contemporary Horace, though he may not have had any similar motives for complaining of excessive appreciation of the earlier or earliest Roman literature. It is true Verrius has told us (Festus 333) how Livius Andronicus was rewarded, but it is more probable that Verrius here copied Varro de Poetis. We cannot help feeling that the gloss as preserved by Festus is based substantially on the phraseological sense of the Augustan time: "Scribas proprio nomine antiqui *et librarios et poetas* vocabant. *At nunc* dicuntur scribae equidem librarii, qui rationes publicas scribunt in tabulis," itaque cum Livius Andronicus

¹ It would hardly do to cite the "Commune Mimorum", Orelli, 2625 or the Collegium Scaenicorum, 4916; or the "Corpus Scaenicorum Latinorum", 2619.

² V. also M. Hertz, Schriftsteller und Publikum in Rom, p. 6, sq. 1853.

³ Or of same *cognati*, for the male descendants seem to have been extinct in the time of Augustus.

⁴ We may think of the unpleasant experiences which the younger Cato had with this guild; also, of the membership held by Horace.

bello Punico Secundo scribisset carmen, quod a virginibus est cantatum, quia prosperius resp. populi R. geri coepta est publice attributa est et in Aventino aedis Minervae, in qua liceret scribis histrionibusque *consistere et dona ponere*, in honorem Livi quia hic et scribebat fabulas et agebat". The association of *scribae* and players need not detain us. Rather may one be inclined to ask what *dona* these were, which were to be placed or might be placed in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine. This matter, as well as the right of regular meetings,¹ so essential for an actual collegium was the main privilege, we may well believe, in the S. C. of autumn 207, a practical consequence of the victory of the Metaurus 207; perhaps directly accomplished by the Consul M. Livius Salinator, to whose house probably the old poet stood in relation of *libertus* (that the *ius patronatus* passed to heirs is well known, Justin. Instit. 3, 8); for that the victor of Sena himself was the poet's original master or owner, as Teuffel thought, would seem to have been impossible, on chronological considerations; more likely it was the father of the Consul of 207 who had the same name.

But to return from this little digression to Verrius or rather to Varro—what *dona* were these? Lucian Müller, p. 31, calls them (as did Hertz before him) in a somewhat off-hand manner "Weihgeschenke". But what person outside of the Collegium had any occasion to "consecrate" such gifts, at least in the older time; certainly not those persons themselves who gave scenic games, whether they were praetors or aediles or the heirs of senators, who, in the Latin-Etruscan manner adorned the funeral celebration with games or some other form of popular largess. Very properly, then, we ask: Could the poor *poetae* and *scribae* consecrate such gifts? Or has Varro here, with his mania for discovering parallels with Greek literary history in the development of Roman letters, been tempted to see something analogous to the dramatic prizes at Athens?² As a matter of fact Verrius-Festus

¹ It would not have been necessary for Lucian Müller to go so far afield to explain *consistere* in Festus. In the post-Clodian time, when Verrius made his extract from Varro, governmental license was very essential. Our epigraphical parallels, it is true, are all from the imperial era: we find also, e. g. *coire, licite coire, Lugduni consistentes*, etc.

² Cf. Fr. Leo, in *Hermes* vol. 24, p. 67 sqq., Varro und die Satire. While unable in the present place to enter into Leo's suggestions in detail, I would like to publish here an emendation of the passage in Liv. 7.2, so much treated from Ritsch? downward: "Livius post aliquot annos, qui ab saturis <orsus> ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere, etc."

says merely *dona*: and if we proceed without prejudice, we are not justified in designating these gifts off-hand as *Weihgeschenke*, as L. Müller does or as Fr. Marx (in his Accius in Pauly-Wissowa) thus calls the portrait-statue of Accius in the temple of the Camenae. A *donum* it clearly was, and we may assume that such portraits, especially busts of dead or living members of the Collegium were not rare in their meeting-place. If this was so, it was not very difficult for Varro in his *Hebdomades* to secure portraits, authentic ones too, of a considerable number of Roman poets of the Pre-Ciceronian periods of Roman letters.¹ As for the prose-writers, who in the main belonged to the aristocracy, *imagines* in abundance were extant in the *atria* of Roman mansions. As for *dona* then, in the Collegium Poetarum, they must in the main have been gifts of the members themselves: and we may well ask, is it not intrinsically probable, that among these *dona* there were MSS of the members, deposited there for safe keeping; for neither had the socially humble *poetae* any *tablina* of their own, nor was there any public library in Rome before Asinius Pollio.²

The earliest contemporary reference to the C. Scribarum or Poetarum if I am not mistaken, is in the *Asinaria* of Plautus. The parasite of young Diabolus has drawn up for the latter (v. 746 sqq.) a regular civil contract, a contract with the *lena*, to secure possession of the *meretrix* Philaenium for one year. The youth turns to the parasite expressing the desire to hear the several stipulations of the contract: "*leges pellege* (Goetz and Schoell's text).

"*Nam tu poeta's*³ *prosus ad eam rem unicus*": i. e. "a *scriba* you are of unparalleled excellence"—and the contract is seen to be soundly drawn. The Collegium Poetarum cannot have been in existence very long when Plautus wrote his *Asinaria*, and still, in current parlance *scriba* and *poeta* must have been fair equivalents. Forcellini indeed thought that in the *Asinaria* passage the word *poeta* was=*artifex*, *architectus*; but this word *poeta* must have come into Latium at a pretty early time (from Campania, I think) nor is it likely that Plautus could have tried to use

¹ Cf. Ritschl, Ulrichs, Brunn, Merklin etc., in Ritschl's *Opuscula* III, p. 508 sqq.

² See the final note on the *Fasti* of Fulvius Nobilior.

³ J. H. Gray, the English editor of the *Asinaria*, has probably missed the sense of the passage.

it before the Roman populace in its etymological and original sense, Plautus, whose words and turns of phrase, and coinage of words appealed to the *ear* of his public, and that, too, with directness and immediateness of effect. No, the scribae-poetae as notaries or composers of current forms of civil law probably constituted a kind of shyster lawyer. Thus, too, we may take the passage in the *Casina* 860: *Nec fallaciam astutiorē ullus fecit | Poeta atque ut haec est fabre facta ab nobis*. Further cf. *Pseudolus* 401: *Sed quasi poeta tabulas quom cepit sibi quaerit quod numquam gentiumst, reperit tamen*. At first sight it seems as if Plautus (or his Greek original) was speaking of the poet's composition specifically, but a more intense examination I believe will make us think of a *writer* in the widest sense.¹

I said above: the *poor* poetae and scribae. As they, most of them, were, without doubt *libertini* or the sons of such, and were dependent upon the practical use of the *stilus* for their living and material support, we may well look round for other forms of *quaestus* than this of writing MSS for *ludi scaenici*, whether the fee came from magistrates or private patrons. For as for the training of actors and rehearsals, that probably was done by the *dominus gregis* such as Ambivius Turpio about 166 sqq. B. C. or the two coryphaei of the Roman stage in Cicero's time, Roscius in comedy and Aesopus in tragedy, ancient Garricks who indeed in their generation gathered great wealth by producing over and over Plautus, Caecilius, Terence, Accius, Pacuvius, etc., while original dramatic production had sunk down to the level of the *mimus*.

But to return to the older time, i. e., to the precarious position of the *scribae* and *poetae*, we cite Cato de moribus in Gellius II 2,² "Poeticae artis honos non erat; si quis in ea re studebat, aut sese ad convivia adplicabat", grassator "vocabatur". I do not believe that in the time of the Hannibalic war the type of the Attic parasite was at all current in actual Roman society; or anything like the *umbrae* of Horace's time or the recipients of *sportulae* in Pliny's or Juvenal's time. How then the *poetae* of the

¹ The *scribae-poetae* gloss in Verrius-Festus 333 has a very lexical flavor. Perhaps Varro (whose personal language seems to have been steeped in Plautinisms) had this note on scribae-poetae in his 28 books de Lingua Latina. For of all Varronian books none would seem to have lent itself so readily to the practical ends of Verrius as the de L. L. That Verrius names Varro so rarely is no proof, of course, against this particular utilization.

² I owe the passage to Hertz.

elder Cato's youth sought and found access to the tables of men of rank, unless as *liberti* to the table of the *patronus*, it is difficult to understand. Perhaps they furnished *carmina* on domestic occasions. But that is a mere conjecture. Closer to facts I believe we are in assuming that members of the Collegium Poetarum furnished funeral inscriptions. Who, e. g., wrote the metrical inscription C. I. L. I p. 218, which Mommsen himself calls a "scite factum epigramma"? (no. 1007 ed. 2). While Mommsen seems to suggest that he does not place full confidence in Osann's attempts to construct smooth iambs, Mommsen's own editing furnishes iambs which, line for line, are—metrically—at least as smooth as by far the greater number of Plautine *senarii* in our actual tradition. Bücheler's edition is subjoined (*Carmina Latina Epigraphica* I, no. 52, p. 25):

Hospes, quod deico, paullum est, asta ac pellege.
 heic est sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai feminae.
 nomen parentes nominarunt Claudiam.
 suom mareitum corde deilexit souo.
 gnatos duos creavit. horunc alterum
 in terra linquit, alium sub terra locat.
 sermone lepido, tum autem incessu commodo.
 domum servavit. lanam fecit. dixi. abei.

Bücheler thinks it may have been of the age of the Gracchi. *Asta, pellege, deico, mareitum*, but much more the trick of *paronomasia*,

"sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai"

remind us of Plautus's time and manner. We may therefore safely see in the author a professional *poeta*, to whom the sorrowing husband has given the data. The virtues of the excellent housewife and consort who has departed too early, are named in the two last lines; and the reference to her charm of conversation and her graceful gait point to a husband who has not yet ceased to be a lover (cf. also v. 4.) and v. 3. is evidently the paraphrase of a professional versifier, who spins out the *e gente Claudia* into a whole verse. In Bücheler's collection and elsewhere there are very few *epigrammata* so old; but we may safely conceive that senatorial and equestrian society constantly and extensively called upon the services of the professional *poeta* not any less than upon the professional *libitinarii* themselves.

I have above given expression to the conjecture that among the *dona* presented to the Collegium Poetarum there were perhaps

also MSS. Before the founding of the libraries of Pollio and Augustus in the Apollo temple on the Palatine—where should the original MSS of Ennius's *Annals* have been preserved? Or are we to think that they passed into the possession of the Scipios? That it was possible in Cicero's day¹ to inspect the old MSS seems evident from Brut. 160: *Burrum semper Ennius, nunquam Pyrrhum*

Vi patefecerunt Bruges,

non *Phryges*: ipsius ANTIQUI declarant LIBRI. The context clearly shows that Cicero desires to adduce an irrefragable authority; and an unprejudiced examination of the passage seems to point to the fact that Cicero could and did inspect the original MSS of Ennius himself. Records of some kind must have been preserved by and in the Collegium. The guild which pursued scrivening and literary composition too, would, naturally, have made and preserved records which told of the entrance or of the exit of members. And here I append a further inquiry: What were the *veteres commentarii* to which Cicero is more inclined to give credence than to the authority of his literary friend Varro, whom elsewhere he esteemed so highly? Compare Brutus 60: "his enim consulibus, ut in *veteribus commentariis* scriptum est, Naevius est mortuus; quamquam Varro noster, diligentissimus investigator antiquitatis, putat in hoc erratum vitamque Naevi producit longius". Varro therefore himself inspected these *commentarii* and subjected them to criticism. Otto Jahn thinks of "die verschiedenen chronikenartigen Aufzeichnungen". Which? Certainly not any governmental ones. These *commentarii* it seems had no specific author, they were no *libri* or *libelli* but looser *chartae*. We must not think of the Didascalica of Accius, nor of the literary-historical writings of Porcius Licinius. Rather, if we proceed without constraint or prejudice it would seem the most facile act of transition to think of the official records of the Collegium, and that they noted the withdrawal of Naevius from the Collegium caused by his arrest in 204.

Let us take one more step forward. I will not now enter upon the question, whether the so-called funeral inscriptions of Naevius and Plautus (Plautus and Pacuvius Gellius 1, 24) were actually intended for this commemorative purpose on their tombs; I do not think so. Even in 1867 O. Jahn (*Satura*, no. 12, *Hermes*

¹ And in Quintilian's: I 7. 22. *Hec nunc E littera terminamus, at veterum comicorum adhuc libris invenio Heri ad me venit*, etc.

vol. 2. p. 243 sq.) considered it as most improbable, while Bücheler, an eminent critic of sepulchral forms, has claimed genuineness for the Pacuvian lines. Jahn thinks of "epideiktische Gedichte, nach dem Vorbilde der Alexandriner, wie schon die Anthologie zeigt, leicht erklärlich bei der Vorliebe der Römer, literar-historische Fragen metrisch zu behandeln". Well, as for the Alexandrians, it would hardly be necessary to go so far afield, though we must freely concede that, from the beginning, the modelling and formative influence of Greek literature was very great.¹ Think of the Greek equipment *ab ovo* of Andronicus of Tarentum, of Ennius of Rudiae, of the constant handling of Menander, Philemon, Diphilos by those members who worked for the Ludi Scaenici, or the introduction of metrical forms from the Old Attic Comedy into these very Latinizations. Is it not very probable, that the members of the Collegium Poetarum themselves composed such verses in honor of their dead fellows and perhaps put these verses on the bases of busts placed in the Collegium itself? What caused remark in the case of Accius (whose *amour propre* was strong in itself), was not that he had a statue of himself placed in the temple of the Camenae² at all, but that the undersized author endowed himself with so tall and stately a figure. (Plin. N. H. 34. 19.)

A great, perhaps an important step in advance is made when we pass from the time of Naevius and Plautus to that of Terence. For the brief and brilliant career of Terence our authorities are the Vita of Varro-Suetonius and the *prologi* of the plays themselves. As for Varro he knew of no better material for his studies than to make extracts from Porcius Licinius, appending, it is true, a criticism based on data derived from another source. Jealousy and ill-will were the elements of adversity with which the favorite of Scipio Aemilianus had to contend, and that too not only in the course of his authorship, but even after his death. Why may not the unmeasured attacks made upon Terence have been due to the fact that Terence did not belong to the *Collegium*? No ideal standard of professional ethics is to be assumed. The potent factors in the aspersions directed against Terence were envy and jealousy, jealousy concerning income or corporate jealousy, or both. Even Caecilius, as Terence in He-

¹ Long before the profession of the *γραμματικός* began in Rome, through the visit of Krates of Mallos, Sueton. Grammatici 2.

² I. e. of Hercules Musarum.

cyra Prol. 14 sqq. makes Ambivius Turpio¹ say, suffered severely in the production of his first two plays. They failed: but why? What were the forces active in the Roman public? Who set them in motion? It was the (v. 22) *iniuria advorsarium*, the wrong inflicted by his opponents. What opponents? Clearly such as had an interest in the failure of the plays written by the former slave. Did they organize a hostile *claque* among the spectators themselves? Ambivius Turpio at least says that Caecilius' opponents caused the failure. But if they practically succeeded they must have been able to avail themselves of the means. Now then, what motives had these 'advorsarii'? Clearly no other than rivalry concerning income and fees—the fees which these intruders such as the Insubrian freedman Caecilius, or later the African freedman Terence, received, the fees which were after all the main concern of the poor *poetae*. Think of Horace's delineation of the fecundity of the Plautine Muse and the motives thereof: Epist. 2, 1, 175—

Gestit enim nummum in loculos demittere, post hoc
Securus cadet an recto stet fabula talo.

When once he has pouched his fee, he is indifferent as to whether the play can maintain itself, (when subject to mature literary judgment,) or not. For the *poetae* clearly had no copyright for further productions of the same play, though this very thing would have been to the interest of the professional writers. The very item of the fee which Terence received for the *Eunuchus*, 8000 sesterces (about \$352) proves what a strong interest was roused by this very matter: something unheard of, i. e., in the Collegium. But when the second effort of the beardless new-comer met with such material reward, how must the professional jealousy of the older *poetae* in the Collegium have been roused! If the hated favorite of fortune belonged to the Collegium in the preceding year when he entered the professional market with his *Andria*, he probably would have read his MS there or submitted it in some way, perhaps privately, and received a recommendation to the Aediles. But the tradition is much more simple, much more natural and evident if we assume that he did *not* himself really belong to the Collegium, when poorly attired (*contemptiore vestitu*) he called on the prosperous Caecilius, having been directed to him by the Aediles, in order to read his MS to him. I am greatly inclined to doubt that Luscius of

¹ Teuffel, L. G. 110, 5, 4.

Lanuvium, the *malivulus vetus poeta* in the prologue of the *Andria* (166 B. C.) was the *only* one to envy young Terence and set in motion his *maledicta* against him (i. e., with the Aediles after they had accepted the MS); perhaps he was only the most active or the most prominent. Besides, Terence points to an entire class of *poetae* with pronouncedly contemptuous words: "istorum obscuram diligentiam", though those jealous fellows never attained a real position and estimation comparable to that of Ennius, Naevius, Plautus. That Luscius, particularly in his treatment of the *Φάσμα*, furnished to Terence a welcome opportunity for technical criticism does not permit us to conclude that Luscius was the only one jealous and envious of the youth whose rapid success had been so dazzling.¹

In the prologue of the *Heauton Timorumenos* (v. 16) there is a plurality

nam quod rumores distulerunt malivoli

though the plural would more easily veil the person of Luscius. In fact the word *tum* (in v. 22) *tum* quod malivulus vetus poeta dicitat indicates an orderly taking up of the several charges made by Luscius; note also the specific 'poeta vetus' in the prologue of the *Phormio* where the aims and motives of the opponents are designated even more clearly. What they really want is that Terence simply stop writing altogether; then they will be content. Nor does the young freedman himself move in the ideal regions of a literary Parnassus. The fees are indeed a very essential matter. They are *the* essential point in the entire controversy. Live and let live (v. 16 sqq.) if you please. It was his bread that Terence defended: v. 18

"Ille *ad famem* hunc ab studio studuit reicere."

And thus the *iniqui* and the *aduorsarii* persecute the friend of Scipio and Laelius with bitter hatred up to the production of his last play, pose as captious critics and bespatter his last MS, though we may doubt whether Luscius and his crew found a ready audience with the gentlemen who paid the fee, for one of the two sons of the victor of Pydna was the particular friend and patron of the young translator of Menander. It is not easy to understand exactly how *rapere in peiorem partem* (Adelph. Prol. 3.) was at all possible or practicable in this case.

¹ I read with Ritschl, Opp. 3. p. 211 nondum quintum atque vicesimum ingressus annum.

But a new problem arises. How are we to explain the fact that even after his death Terence was persecuted with a hatred so intense, a hatred that ignored or distorted the facts? We observe that Porcius Licinius¹ in his metrical history of Roman poetry—as his work may be called—speaks of the sudden death of Terence in an odious vein which is not far from positive delight. This is made sufficiently evident by the trochaic tetrameters cited by Suetonius (Varro): And what then—this is characteristic of the Roman spirit—is the most disgraceful thing in the story of Terence's death? *That he did not leave any estate at all.* Not even a hired tenement was there to which the slave who had accompanied Terence to Greece could carry the report of his master's death. This statement of Porcius is corrected by Suetonius-Varro from whom we learn that Terence had the deeds of an estate of twenty iugera on the Appian road, and that, in consequence his daughter was in so high a degree *locabilis* that she wedded a Roman knight. The inference lies near that Porcius cherished personal hatred of Terence. Or was it rather a hatred fomented by the guild? But where were Terence's noble friends? Scipio Aemilianus must have been dead when Porcius wrote these lines, for the poor *poeta* would not have dared to use the name of Aemilianus thus, and if he had dared, still he writes as of the dead:

Tres per idem tempus qui agitabant nobiles facillume.

Further proofs of hatred are to be found in the abominable suggestion *ob florem aetatis suae*, etc. and in the explanation of Terence's departure for Greece. *Post sublatis rebus* (entirely impoverished, v. Ritschl, opp. 3, 327=*re familiari* 'perdita' vel 'pessumdata') *ad summam inopiam redactus est. Itaque* a conspectu omnium abiit Graeciam in terram ultimam. He was ashamed of his utter poverty, a poverty so utter that he could no longer maintain his social position among the aristocracy: *therefore* he went far away, to the ends of the earth. The phrase *terram ultimam*, geographically absurd, may be easily explained psychologically. A person who really knew Scipio and Laelius, could not very well write of them in the vague general manner in which Porcius did:

'Dum lasciviam nobilium et laudes *fucosas* petit,

'Dum Africani vocem divinam inhiat avidis auribus,

'Dum se ad Furium cenare et Laelium pulcrum putat—'

¹ Ritschl, *Parerga*, in three passages wrote Licinius, v. p. 637.

These are the utterances of a man who never enjoyed such social privileges, of a man whose words were dictated by envy. Orelli and Ritschl¹ after him have placed the time in which Porcius flourished 640-114, B. C. The chronological argument by which the time of Porcius is evolved, viz., the fact that Gellius (19, 9, 10) names him *before* G. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102 B. C.), this chronological argument is not very decisive or significant, although Madvig, too, (Opusc. 1834 p. 107) avails himself of it. I would beg to say in dissenting from scholars so eminent, that we may be justified in believing that the elegiac distich in question is one of the earliest efforts in this form of metre.

At all events we are safe in saying that 129 B. C., the year of Aemilianus' death, was the *terminus post quem* of Porcius' didactic poem on the history of Roman poetry, a history which, if Terence be a fair sample, must have had a pronounced biographical character.²

Now as the initial portions were composed in trochaic tetrameters,—for the familiar lines (Gell. 17, 21, 45) clearly deal with the beginning:

Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu
Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram,—

and as the lines on Terence were composed in the same metre, we may well infer from these two specimens, that the *whole* didactic poem was written in this measure. If Greek models had been followed, one would have expected the didactic hexameter. The trochaic measure is probably due to the fact that Porcius also was one of the comedy-writers and followed the tradition and usage of the Collegium Poetarum.³ The aim was metrically to outdo New Attic Comedy from which the *poetae* derived pretty nearly all their subject-matter. But why did Porcius place the *incunabula* of Roman poetry in the period of the Hannibalic war, and thus pass over, in the main, the production of Andronicus? Perhaps because he began his history with the institution or rather the official governmental recognition of the Collegium Poetarum of 207 B. C. In fact, we may safely assume that in this Collegium Poetarum minutes or records were kept, anniversaries were observed, busts were set up, often in consequence of testa-

¹ Parerga, p. 243, 540 is a misprint for 640.

² Thus it was said of Ennius, that he *coluisse Tutilina loca*, Varro L. L. 5, 163.

³ As Lucian Müller l. c. p. 30 sqq. briefly sets forth.

mentary directions and supplied with inscriptions by members of the corporation, above all other things record was made again and again and survey was had of the history of the art of poetry in Rome. It was clearly *this* interest that evoked performances such as the poem of Porcius; and this historical poem was probably recited in the Collegium on some anniversary or corporate celebration and afterwards deposited as a *donum* in the archives of the guild, where scholars such as Varro could inspect it. Hence the extraordinary acrimony with which Terence was treated in that poem. The fact seems to be, that Terence never belonged to the Collegium, and that the attitude and the feeling with which he was judged in the guild, soon became a tradition and norm of appreciation from Luscius' times downward.

Another step forward will bring us to the much discussed "canon" of Volcarius Sedigitus. This table assigns a very peculiar rank indeed to Terence, Gell. 15, 24, 1, and it is highly probable that this metrical survey of the performances of Roman poets was also written *within* the guild, if not directly *for* the guild. There was no literature of erudition before Varro. There was no public for such a performance. The metrical form shows that it was intended for recitation and, presumably, to the guild.

Porcius himself was dead. Otherwise Volcarius would scarcely have ranged him among the comedy-writers. As a matter of fact, Porcius actually receives the fourth place, while Terence must be content with the sixth. We may assume the date of the poem to have been about 100 B. C. The enumeration of Porcius himself does not permit us to place the time much earlier and it remains almost inexplicable that half a century or so after the death of Terence any unprejudiced literary judgment should have assigned to Terence so mean a place as is here done. We still have to do, I believe, with the actual tradition of the Collegium which remained permanently unfriendly to the favorite of Scipio Aemilianus.

Nor can it be a mere accident that we possess both of Cicero and of Caesar the well-known metrical appreciations of Terence. What was the occasion that evoked verses like these?

Making full allowance for the precocity of these two types in the history of the decadent republic, one would not dare seriously to suggest that as youths or boys they wrote such lines under the direction of some *grammaticus*, for their own particular grammatici were men of specific *Greek* training. At least we may

assume that about 90-80 B. C. the *poetae* in the guild had to make a living to some extent as *grammatici*, for after Accius there was substantially no further literary production of plays proper. And at the same time they had to compete with the Greeks residing in Rome. Of the *grammatici* enumerated by Suetonius, Laelius, Archelaus and Vettius Philocomus were probably Campanians and semi-Greeks, Lutatius Daphnis, *libertus* of C. Lutatius Catulus, was a Greek, as was Saeuvius Nicanor; Aurelius Opilius (*Epicurei cuiusdam libertus*, Sueton. Gramm. 6) probably was nothing else; M. Pompilius Andronicus (*natione Syrus*) a Greek from the East, Ateius Philologus a native of Athens, literary assistant of Sallust and of Asinius Pollio.

Such and similar men were the owners and directors of the 'super viginti celebres scholae', which according to Suetonius l. c. 3 flourished in Rome about 100-90 B. C., and it is natural that the guild which had dealt with letters and in a measure had had versification in its control should have not abstained from teaching letters and literature.

Thus Accius particularly had been active in a two-fold manner. Not only was he a playwright—we know of more than forty of his plays—but he also undertook to exercise a decisive influence on Latin orthography, and thus made himself the butt of the satire of Lucilius who as a Campanian was probably more versed in Greek than Accius and therefore in grammar; and it is altogether likely that Accius presented his rules in the Collegium, of which he was an eminent, nay the most eminent member. Why should he have followed Greek analogies so closely? It may simply have been the vanity of old age, the desire to shine not only as a poet but as a grammaticus or a literary dictator. But it seems to me that there is a better, a more practical reason. All this grammatical knowledge may have been contained in the nine books *Διδασκαλικῶν*. Now this work was a kind of cyclopedia. It began with Homer and Hesiod and described the course of Greek literature or the development of the different types of literary form, and then passed over to the *Fasti* of Roman poetry and also contained an index of genuine Plautine plays. But why was it called *Didascalica*? We must not overlook the objective character of this title which corresponds to the *Pragmatica* of the other work. Scholars have long observed that Accius' work was much more comprehensive than the dramatic chronological collections of Peripatetic erudition. Such

a work at some point must have had a connection with the practical vocation and livelihood of the *poeta* who had grown gray in the Collegium Poetarum. But why, Gronov asked, did Suetonius not even name Accius or did not even mention him in passing, among the Roman grammatici? Gronov, we must remember, went so far as to abjudicate the *Didascalica* from Accius and adjudicate them to Ateius Philologus. The point is even now to gain a clear idea (though since Madvig's essay¹ no one entertains any doubts as to Accius' authorship) how the D. were connected with the person and profession of Accius. Accius was an older contemporary of L. Aelius Stilo the teacher of Varro. But the latter dedicated the work of his early manhood, *de antiquitate literarum*, not to Stilo, but to Accius. And this he did because Accius impressed that generation as a great authority in the domain of the *grammaticus*. Is it not simple and natural that Accius *taught* those things or such things as were contained in the *Didascalica*? The latter, we may assume, contained everything which a grammaticus *Greek or Latin* could teach a Roman boy. As to the history and appreciation of Roman poetry it was preëminently the chosen province of the man who, in the Collegium Poetarum had so lively a consciousness of his own worth (according to the familiar story in Val. Max. 3, 7, 11) that he utterly ignored the aristocratic position and birth of Julius Caesar Strabo, and that not on one occasion only, but regularly.

It was the professional competition of grammatici (perhaps mainly the Greek ones) who were outside of the Collegium Poetarum that in my judgment evoked the cyclopedic work of Accius.

But I return from the master in the guild to the guild itself. The above-mentioned Julius Caesar Strabo, whom Cicero, de Oratore II, chose as exponent of Wit and Fun, came frequently into the Collegium, came frequently, for (Accius) 'in collegium poetarum venienti *nunquam* adsurrexit'. In all probability the young aristocrat did not enter the Collegium before he was eighteen or twenty years old, and Accius, who was about forty years older, could maintain his dignity without causing much remark. Still, some remark there was, and it would be interesting to know why Caesar Strabo visited the Collegium Poetarum at all.

¹ De L. Attii didascalicis commentatio, opusc. 1834 no. 4.

He was born about 120 and, in 92 when he was twenty-eight, was already famous through the vein of wit and humor which marked his court speeches. Therefore his tragedies were probably mere *parerga*, mere exercises in versification; and he wished to use the Collegium in order to produce his plays by *recitatio* or gain the benefit of competent technical criticism. That he *belonged* to the club as Lucian Müller (Ennius 31) infers, in the sense of being a member, I do not believe. It is more likely that he was *patronus* of a regular member. Young Cicero, too, had conversations with Accius as the accepted master of literary theory and practice. The precocious youth was filled with a glowing and passionate desire to discover by every possible means the secret of the power of form as wielded, e.g., by Antonius and Crassus; and in his frequent talks with Accius (ex L. Accio poeta sum audire *solitus*, Cic. Brut. 107) his aim was doubtless to learn as much as possible about language and literary power from this other master of Roman speech. The time must have been about 90, for Cicero must have taken the *toga virilis*. And the place was probably the Collegium Poetarum itself where the venerable author could be found at regular times. And now at last I am able to return to the verses of Caesar and Cicero on Terence. Cicero was Caesar's senior by six years. Cicero's *Δειμῶν* was clearly nothing but the collective title given to his youthful essays in versification. But if the piece on Terence was in this collection, how are we to explain the puzzling resemblance in the initial verse of both Cicero and Caesar?

Cicero: Tu quoque qui solus lecto sermone, Terenti—

Caesar: Tu quoque tu in summis, o dimidiate Menander—

It is hard to assume a rivalry in such *Iusus* between Caesar at eighteen and Cicero at twenty-four, and we must grope our way in the darkness of tradition, and that way leads to the Collegium Poetarum, the character of which is given in the reasons that Valerius Maximus assigns for the demeanor of Accius toward young Caesar Strabo: non maiestatis eius immemor, sed quod in comparatione communium studiorum aliquanto superiorem se esse confideret. Quapropter insolentiae crimine caruit, *quia ibi voluminum non imaginum certamina*. Nor are these words to be set down as a mere rhetorical antithesis of the rhetorical Valerius. The Collegium Poetarum flourished still in the reign

of Tiberius and down at least to Martial's time: cf. 3, 30, 8 sq.

An otiosus in schola poetarum
Lepore tinctos Attico sales narrat?

It was evidently a good place for the leisure hours of witty talkers and the description reminds one of the modern club. Add. 4, 61, 3 sq.

Quartus dies est, in schola Poetarum
Dum fabulamur, etc.

The guild was alive not only with the rivalry of *recitationes*, but also with pleasant conversations of members with one another, or with patrons or with younger men who desired to recite their productions before this, the most competent available tribunal of versification. And so I consider it very probable that the literary appreciations of Terence ascribed to Caesar and Cicero were originally recited in the Collegium, though not at the same time. The theme of the relative rank of Roman poets was a standard one and we may believe that young aspirants in letters and versification treated the same theme again and again metrically and tried their wings so that many hexametrical phrases may thus have become mere formulae. And the parallelism with Greek authors doubtless soon became a stock theme in the training of youth, especially since the appearance in Rome of the Greek γραμματικοί.

In conclusion a number of observations remain in connection with the literary era of Horace and Vergil. Vergil probably did not belong to the Collegium Poetarum if we may judge by the data of his literary biography. Who had an interest so strong as the members of the guild¹ to know or to publish what sums the poet received from his patrons, how much, e. g., he received per hexameter from the sorrowing Octavia for his lines on her son Marcellus in Aen. VI, dena sestertia.² They were as jealous of him as they were of Terence, for his eclogues had been put upon the boards as a kind of *mimus*. Through the normal operation of the civil law (bonorum possessio) it may be that the sum total of his estate reached the public and the *poetae* of the corporation were sure to make a note of it: Donatus § 24 Possedit prope centies sestertium (ab. \$440,000, a vast fortune for a recluse and celibate) *ex liberalitatibus amicorum*. The same humble

¹ As Bavius and Maevius, the stars in the classic Dunciad.

² Donatus vita § 47.

professionals of the guild probably also made a note of the stupendous fee which Vergil's friend and house-mate Varius received from Octavianus Caesar for his Thyestes, deciens sestertium.

Where are we to look for Vergil's *obtrectatores* (Don. 61) if not in the Collegium? On this theory the parodying author of the "Antibucolica", Carvilius Pictor and his *Aeneidomastix* (Don. 62), also the critics named further on, Herennius, Perillius, Faustinus, Q. Octavius Avitus, grammatici, would have been not only *grammatici* but also members of the Collegium Poetarum. Professional jealousy and the spirit of carping even after Vergil's death, as it could not be otherwise in the case of the Aeneid, must have been more active with practical versifiers than with mere *grammatici*.

When we read in Donatus 20 that Vergil made of Cebes a *poeta* and of Alexander a *grammaticus*, we are to interpret the statement to mean that he advanced them so far by technical training that as freedmen they could make a living by these professions. *Poeta* is used without qualification just like *grammaticus*, and we may well believe that, as far as a living was concerned, the *poeta* entered upon a well-defined profession no less than the *grammaticus*. Think of the carmina made to order for birthdays, marriages, funerals and sepulchral inscriptions, metre being the main thing for the public at large.

Horace concludes our survey. To his guild of the *scribae*, differentiated for some time from the *poetae*, he may have remained faithful, at least so far as formal membership was concerned: 2 Sat. 6, 36—

de re communi scribae magna atque nova te
orabant hodie meminisses Quinte reverti.

His criticism of Lucilius had provoked counter-criticism; perhaps mainly among the friends of the older classics—perhaps in the Collegium, too. Clearly, however, in Sat. 1, 10, 36 sqq.—as we can gather from Porphyrio—when the friend of Maecenas turns his keen stilus against Furius Bibaculus whose turgid heroic verses were declaimed in the abode of the corporation, his ridicule is meant for the guild as well and for its president Tarpa:

Turgidus Alpinus (i. e. Furius) iugulat dum Memnona dumque
diffingit Rhēni luteum caput, haec ego ludo
quae neque in aede sonent certantia iudice Tarpa
nec redeant, etc.

In which passage *certantia* reminds one of the later phrase of Valerius Maximus: voluminum *certamina* *exercebantur*. It is most probable then that at these readings pairs of poets, wherever feasible, appeared who had written in the same metres, and that after both had been heard, Tarpa gave his verdict. For as for the metrical form itself, we may well believe with Lucian Müller that the ears of the *poetae* in the Collegium must have been quite acute through the long practical and living tradition of technical execution and technical judgment. Tarpa was known even to Cicero. In 55 B. C. he selected plays for production, by order of Pompey. Even when Horace wrote *Ad Pisones* 387, he was still in vogue as a competent critic through the ear, as is clear from Horace and his commentators.¹

Horace indeed probably not only strolled about the Campus Martius at eventide, and priced vegetables, but also listened with supreme delight to the resonance of the lines declaimed in the club-house, the temple of the Camenae. To him the whole guild was a body of which he stood in no awe and for whose critical good-will he felt but very slight concern. Conversely indeed it was not so. Whether the bore of I Sat. 9 was of the guild we cannot tell, nor whether by *profanum vulgus* (Carm. 3, 1, 1) he meant the versifiers of the club. Still he could hardly have meant the poor *plebs* of the street, the common poor folk who merely tried to exist. Why should *they* have envied the poet who had risen with such dizzy rapidity, why should they press upon him? Perhaps the *carmina non prius audita* are designed to form a contrast to the *carmina* of the Collegium Poetarum. A professional *poeta* certainly could not live from the *recitationes* in the temple of the Muses, readings or declamations which were meant in part to recommend their authors to the public, i. e. to the public of patrons who ordered poems. In 2 Ep. 2, 102,

Multa fero ut placem genus irritabile vatum,

the very considerable degree of consideration implied forbids our thinking of the despised declaimers of the guild: Kiessling specifically thinks of the "Roman Kallimachos", Propertius.

¹ Kiessling on Hor. I Sat. 10, 36 sqq. has doubted Porphyrio's "in aede Musarum" but this is clearly in accord with Pliny's N. H. 34, 19 *in Camenarum aede*.

Bentley's suggestion to write (Hor. 2 Ep. 2, 92) instead of

caelatumque novem Musis opus
sacratumque novem Musis opus

has not found definite acceptance with the editors. But the astounding wealth of learning which the great critic of Cambridge brings to bear on this point contains some clues also for problems connected with the present inquiry. Kiessling has doubted Porphyrio's note on Hor. I Sat. 10, 38: "in aede Musarum." Could he have believed that the abode of the Collegium Poetarum had still been in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine and that "Musarum" (Camenarum) was only a poetical paraphrase? This blunder is palpably committed by Sellar, *The Rom. Poets of the Republic* p. 145 "into the place of meeting of the 'Poets' Guild" on the *Aventine*, where he tells of the anecdote of Accius and Caesar Strabo.

The *Aedes Musarum* (Camenarum) the meeting-place of the Collegium Poetarum according to Bentley was the temple of *Hercules Musarum*: See Preller-Jordan *Röm. Myth.* II. 298: "Welchem letzteren M. Fulvius Nobilior in der Nähe des Circus Flaminius einen mit schönen Kunstwerken aus der Beute von Ambrakia verzierten Tempel gestiftet hatte, den L. Marcus Philippus, der Stiefvater des Augustus erneute". For there was also a *Ἡρακλῆς Μουσῳαγέτης*, as Preller shows in the foot-note. Now this item which Bentley already had recorded probably affords us, at least approximately, the period of time in which the Collegium Poetarum removed from the Aventine to a site much more favorable from the point of view of income and livelihood. M. Fulvius Nobilior triumphed in December 187 B. C., *de Aetolis et de Cephallenia* Liv. 39, 5, 13. Among the 785 bronze figures and the 230 marble figures which Fulvius brought over there were most probably not only the Nine Muses, but also, if we consider the strong literary interests of the friend and patron of Ennius, portrait-figures of the great Greek poets. The literary interest of the victor of Aetolia must have been a strong one, as he took Ennius along, for which Cato censured him. Here, in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* Fulvius himself (Macrob. Sat. I 12, 16) deposited his own *Fasti*, his History of Rome. Perhaps the transfer to the new abode of the Collegium Poetarum was an act of consideration towards Ennius himself. The symbolism of *Hercules Musarum* was transparent: Fulvius wished to commemorate both his victorious movement and his devotion

to literary culture. That in the course of time the name *Herculis* was generally omitted in naming the temple was partly due to the habit of abbreviation current with the practical Romans, partly due also to the numerical preponderance of the Nine Muses, partly also due to the fact that later on Mummius consecrated a temple of Hercules Victor. That the figures of the Muses were part of the original loot from Greece seems to be implied in Plin. N. H. 35, 10, 66: (Zeuxis) fecit et figlina opera quae sola in Ambracia relictæ sunt, cum inde *Musas* Fulvius Nobilior Romam transferret.

Bentley on Hor. 2 Ep. 2, 92, cites also Juvenal 7, 37, and Ovid Trist. 3, 1, 69. J. B. Mayor on the passage from Juvenal adopts the confusion of the Scholiasta Cruquianus on Hor. I Sat. 10, 38: Tarpa fuit iudex criticus, auditor assiduus poematum et poetarum in aede Apollinis SEU (sic) *Musarum* quo convenire poetae solebant suaeque scripta recitare. It would seem to be risky to leave Bentley unread in any problem of Horatian scholarship.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

E. G. SIHLER.

II.—A BÂLE MS OF CONSENTIUS.

Though there is nothing to be said for the two short works of the grammarian Consentius on the score of interest, and but little on that of scientific knowledge, still the second of them, the treatise "*de barbarismis et metaplasms*" can claim for itself some little importance, partly for the details it gives of the barbarisms in the pronunciation of Latin indulged in by the Greeks, Gauls, and Africans, and partly for its information on the ancient methods of scansion. Not that too much stress need be laid on Consentius' suggestions as to scansion, for he seems, like Humpty-Dumpty, to have possessed the faculty of explaining any verse that ever was written and a good many that weren't and never would be. At any rate, finding in his copy of Vergil a verse which read

ad soceros atque auo puerum Astianacta trahebat,

he never stopped to think that there might be a mistake—scanning, not thinking, was his business just then, so he scanned through it all. '*scandimus enim sic, rostquea, ex quo apparet inter duas consonas a uocalem perisse*'. There are several other things that are still more apparent: but that is neither here nor there. There is, however, some little importance in the work; and as it was formerly in the pitiable condition of being preserved in one solitary MS, Prof. Lindsay is to be congratulated on unearthing another and older one at Bâle. It is at his suggestion that I have undertaken a collation of it, and I have to thank him not only for that suggestion, but also for kind assistance on grammatical points.

The MS comes originally from Fulda, and is now numbered F III 15 in the Library at Bâle. It consists of but two quires, one of 9 the other of 6 leaves, and is written in a pointed Irish minuscule hand of the 9th century. Ff. 1-8 contain '*hissidorus iunioris spalensis de uitiiis liber*' (i. e. *Isid. Orig. I. 34-36*); f. 8^v *Explicit Issidori Iunioris Episcopi. Incipit ars consentii .u. c. de bar. et solo.* which ends on f. 14^v, where it is succeeded by a short treatise of one page entitled simply '*uictō*'. This is appar-

ently identical with the excerpt from the 'codex Vossianus 37' (Keil V 327), beginning 'Soloecismus quid est?'; but it continues further, ending on f. 15^v with the words 'et appellatur grece μεταπλασμος'.

That B, though older than M, in any way supersedes it one cannot, I think, contend; nor indeed could one reasonably expect it. But that it is quite M's equal, and that no edition is complete without considering its variants, is incontestable. For example, in the most important part of the work, the details about pronunciation, B introduces two valuable alterations. 392 3 'temporis, ut quidam dicunt piper producta priore syllaba, cum sit brevis, quod uitium Afrorum familiare est'. In B we find the words 'uel pius' after 'piper', and as the words are not likely to be an after-insertion, we may take it that Consentius regarded the well-known late Latin lengthening of the 'i' in 'pius' as a specially African fault. The evidence of inscriptions supports this view, though hardly so conclusively as one would wish. Christiansen in his work, 'De Apicibus et I longis inscriptionum Romanarum' quotes 1 instance from the 2nd volume of the Corpus, 2 from the 9th and 4 from the 10th, whereas I find 13 in the African volume (vol. 8¹). It must be admitted that Christiansen quotes besides the instances mentioned no less than 14 from the Roman volume (vol. 6), but then the length of that volume and the fact that all nationalities would be represented in it must be taken into account.

395 3 ecce ut in tali uerbo ita pingue nescio quid sonat ut dicunt etiam nihil de media syllaba infringant. Graeci contra, ubi non debent infringere de sono eius litterae infringunt, ut cum dicunt optimum, mediam syllabam ita sonant, quasi post t z graecum ammiscant. The beginning of the sentence is emended by Keil to 'ecce in littera t aliqui': but B offers a much better contrast to the 'Graeci contra' by reading 'ecce ut Itali ita pingue nescio quid sonant ut cum dicant ita etiam'. But the more important variant is at the end of the sentence, where B in place of the impossible z reads .r., the very letter to which the debatable i or u in optimum is often compared by the grammarians. (v. Lindsay Lat. Lang., p. 25.)

The quotations from former authors are unfortunately not of much importance, as most of them are from Vergil: there is,

¹ Corpus Inscr. Lat. VIII 236, 320, 777, 4196, 4595, 7964, 9436, 9460, 10253, 11335, 12228, 12741, 14792.

however, one exception, the passage from Ennius mentioned by Prof. Lindsay in his notice of the MS (Berl. Phil. Woch. 27 Febr. and 26 March, 1904). The MS there reads 'dempsit enim unam litteram r per metaplasum: et Ennius huic statuam statui maiorum orbatur Athenis (morbo *in marg.*) per metaplasum quoque et hic dempsit litteram .r(s *supra*).¹ In the other quotations B reads rightly 'fuit Ilium et ingens' (401. 20, 402. 5) and 'excusaque pectore Iuno' (402. 30): and considering the number of Vergilian quotations, there is no doubt that the reading 'coniugio eacidae pirri' (401. 5, cf. Verg. Aen. III. 296) is correct.

Of the conjectures received in Keil's text or recorded in his 'apparatus criticus' B confirms several. 385 15 barbarismus est 387 2 prouenit (Buttmann) 388 20 ut-faciat (Buttmann) 389 18 duarum syllabarum 391 1 lucius M, Lucilius Cramer et Hertz, luci(li *supra*)us B 391 25 barbarismus fiat 392 37 barbarismus fiat 392 37 quod est 394 31 in 32 ut 395 2 in 4 ut cum dicunt (Cramer) 396 13 casuum (Buttmann) 14 eum (Cramer) 19 ex 397 6 fecimus 15 per 28 dicimus) *om.* 399 3 haec exempla sunt huiusmodi. defenditur (Buttmann) 393 27 B reads 'barbarismus uel qualis p p uerris nummos acciperat, cum optima(e *supra*) esset potuisset (*in marg.* est si possuisset) ex trocheo et ione maiore nummos uerres acciperat' confirming Keil's conjecture. 395 27 de gestu et dictione M, Cramer emended dictione to actione, B confirms and betters his suggestion reading de actione, which explains the corruption dictione.

In many other passages B has preserved the right word or phrase where M has corrupted it. Of such cases I select a few of the most important, relegating the rest to the general collation.

387 23 barbarismus uero ab imprudentibus nulla aut ueterum aut consuetudinis auctoritate perspecta assumitur. item inter barbarismum.

B reads 'adsumatur. Ad summum inter,' and seeing how closely 'ad summum inter' resembles the preceding 'adsumitur,' there is little doubt that the copyist of M overlooked it and then repeated the 'item' which begins the last two or three clauses.

391 29 iidem ipsi, et metaplasum et barbarismum eiusdem lectionis utuntur exemplis Keil emended this by inserting 'dicentes' after 'barbarismum' B suggests another solution reading

¹ v. Prof. Lindsay's note on this line in the Journal of Philology XXII. 43 (1893) p. 7: where he suggests that the corruption may lay in "maiorum," which may be a mistake for "mamorum", (= marmorum).

'et ad metaplasum et ad barbarismum.' It also with Clemens reads 'hisdem' which, though possible, is no improvement.

395 18 fortasse 'sint etiam genitalia quarundam nationum qui suae linguae puritatem uolunt custodire diligenter ut euitare ipsi possint quae obseruare et animaduertere debent.

Keil altered 'genitalia' to 'generalia,' inserted 'uitia' after 'nationum,' and transposed the rest of the sentence placing 'quae-debent' before 'qui.' B supports his insertion of 'uitia,' but for the rest it gives a simpler and quite satisfactory reading 'gentilia quorundam uitia quae qui suae—possint et obseruare et animaduertere debent.'

396 28 porro qui dicit strenuam, dicitur et barbarismum facere et soloecismum per artis regulas, quod strenae singulari numero non dicuntur.

B correctly supplies after 'soloecismum' 'barbarismum quidem per adiectionem literae. solocismum per'

397 29 quod enim iam per artis regulam a latinitate sumptum est Keil conjectures remotum, Buttmann semotum, but B's reading 'summotum' would much more naturally be corrupted to 'sumptum.'

398 19 magna enim pars scientiae, qua iudicemus, constetne versus, an non constet, ex intellectu metaplasmodum pendetne an non pendet?

B reads 'deiuicamus' and there seems no good reason for the Indicative. The variant 'utque consistit' for 'an non pendet' suggests that the interrogative form of the sentence may be merely a repetition of the former interrogative: and the correct form may be 'pendetque atque consistit.'

398 hi et alii tales non auctoritate aliqua praerogatiua artis aut consuetudinis defenduntur. B reads 'hii enim' and the first hand omits 'praerogatiua': but in the margin is added 'non praerogatiua aliqua' which may well be right.

400 25 isdem litteris scribetur, plusque intellectus defendendi uorsus ratione inducit metaplasmi potestatem, prout haec ipsa ratio persuaserit.

Keil emends this reading of M by substituting 'ratio' and 'potestate' for 'ratione' and 'potestatem.' B offers a better solution reading 'solusque' for 'plusque' and 'haec aut illa ratio.'

In the collation which follows I omit as a rule mere misspellings.

Incipit ars consentii u. c. de bā. et solō.

386 3 Barbarismus . . distat 4 conueniunt ipsis communes sunt coniuncte 5 est) *om.* 7 ut et 9 in communi sermone 10 quod firmum dixit in 11 pars aliqua orationis 12 est) *om.* 13 nuntiatione hoc ideo nuntiationem habent in reprehensione 15 sui parte 16 adiectionem et inmotationem et transmotationem litterarum et 18 admonere 21 uel temporibus) *om.* 23 ussum pars aliqua cum) *om.* 24 gallorum hastas 25 difinitionem metaplasmi 26 una) *om.* 387 2 modis). *om.* 3 tam barbā quam metaplasmi: (= *us*) hanc (*om.* primam) 4 nuntiatione 6 oblice literarum siriem concidendo 7 duobus) enim 8 aut inmutacione aut transmotacione) *om. adscr. in marg.* 10 indubitante 11 fiet uel in sill') *om. adscr. in marg.* 12 adspirā. Inter barbaris et metā nunc oportunum et tempestiuum est, ut quae sit distantia proloquamur 14 de) *om.* 14, 15 exempla sua // uius accomodabimus 15 suaui (*corr. in marg.*) 18 est) *om.* 19 a quibusdam (*om. locis*) 20 uetere' scriptorum uel) *om.* praeiudicata(e *supra*) 22 fit poetis 30 manifestis 31 apertis apparebunt exemplis 32 locis 34 ut est penatibus. dixit enim gnato) *om.* 35 contra 36 pro operit coperit barbarismum faciet 37 syllabae ut 38 serius 388. 4 imperatorem est) *om.* quaedam (*corr. quae eadem*). 7 pro magi 9 aut syll extractione 10 sermo prima 11 motatus sit. lit 12 debuerit syll 13 mediae parti(e *supra*) dictionis lit sill ue subtrahitur 15 mesteus *m* 1, mnestus *m* 2 pro mnesteus 16 manet acita [menta(e *supra*)re] postum (acita *al. m. in ras. mente re al. m supra*). in gurgite uasto) *om.* 19 pro commemorat pro mouerat) *al. m. in marg.* 22 ut est tendit suam do hii 23 uel detractatione) *om.* 25 de eis loquemur 27 censente(v *supra*)r 28 metaplasmi) *om.* 29 iectasis et sistole. ectasis 30 fit 389 2 et nu 3 antiqua e cedro) *om.* propriamque dicabo et) *om.* 6 est a ut est et amore dianaē. sistole est e contrari: 8 castigat 9 et) *om.* 10 ob iram 11 duo) *adscr. supra* 11 qualitate sibi 12 qui(b. *supra*) h. 13 unus dia(e *supra*)resis (*om. est*) dia(e *supra*)risis. 16 phoebo 17 q dificitur 18, 19 ut dicere phe(o *supra*)ton pro phoeton et marciporro puer órph(o *supra*)eus nam (órpheus pro *adscr. in marg.*) 20 orpheus in syluis (in III syllabis *in marg.*) 20-22 metri causa facitur quis et meēt 23 calliopia 24 prothei pro prothei." menelaus ("prothei *in marg.*) 25 idomenei //ducem (idomeneia *adscr. in marg.*) 25 teyas (*et* 27) 27 ut) *om.* 28 dicat aliquis dissyllabo quod trissyllabo fere nuntiamus 29 barbarismum faciet) *om.* 30 post haec sunt II metaplasmi quos 31 scripturis relinquunt 32 est)

om. 390 1 praebetur 2 ipse - reliquit) *om. sed add. in marg.* 'ut ipse poet. ita uel scriptis reliquit' 5 penitus) *om.* 6 ait) *om.* fuit 7 q: et (*in marg.* q: ut est) 8 quale est Kart(h *supra*)ago 9 ei) et accidit et 10 iactatus et alto) *om.* ipse) idem 11 est) *add. supra* 12 eam) eadem 13 quale est ille~~t~~ terris hii 14 separatim) *om.* 15 quorundam longiorum 16, 17 cum litera pro litera ponitur ut motatio sit 17 autem syllabarum 18 quae cum fuerit 21 et per adspirationem 22, 23 pone et ergo et prop̄ per transmutationem 24 motaret tum erat ut metaplasum 26 motet 26 ratio est) *om.* 27 ut uideo 29 inter me(ta *supra*)plasmum 29 speciem) *om.* themesin ea(n *supra*)dem 30 dicunt) *om. add. in marg.* 31 de) *om.* partes) *om.* laborum) *om.* 32 possui(t *supra*) (sui *in ras*) 33 partem eius) *om.* 34 parte (i *supra*) 35 partiunculas 36 pro septemtrioni) *om.* 391 in metro) *om.* q. non haec) *om.* 4 dicunt *om.* tris 5 septem trioni 6 enuntiata uideris esse unam 7, 8 septemtrioni compositam illam quidem tamen unam partem 10 admonenda 11 adiecitur 12 in ea(o *supra*) nam et o 14 per) *om.* 16 atque) idque 17 in (*add. supra*) erat trissyllabae erat trisyllaba 18 plerum (ae *supra*)que 19 possit 20 motasse hoc) *om.* et arbor) *om.* 22, 23 lapidicinas in neutroque (et lapidicinos *add. in marg.*) non) *om.* 25 tempestiu: proferi(e *supra*)m: 27 quo eorum uitium factum est ut confusse pene barbarismus quid metaplasmus sit 29 interdum // idem 392 1 totum cotidie pro (to *in ras. al. m.*) 2 dicat tutrussit (*pro trussit add. in marg.*) 4 ut qui dicens 5 acui(a *supra*)t syllabam enuntia(e *supra*)t 6 ut qui amens scribens adieciat 9 ut qui dicunt 11 ut si dicat quod et 12 ut si oratorem priorem 13 circumflexo) *om.* ut si honorem 16 pro ste(a *supra*)tim diliciosa quadam 16 siquis ta//(r *supra*)-tarum pro tartaro dicat 19 thraciam 20 khartaginem 21 siquis 21 ebhro 23 barbarismi sic fiunt 23 literae ut plerum pro praelo reilquum (*in marg.* leriq(v *supra*)um) 24 reliquo interpetror (*marg.* interpetror) 25 dis//pli(ci *supra*)na prodicens) *om.* 28 thrachiam 29 apparet adspiratione (*om.* et) 30 alios 32 est) *om.* 32 diuresis et sistole sed et hos et caeteros 33 uellimus aduertere 34 animaduertimus 35 barbarismo quos 36 dieresin barbarismum facere 37 quod est dissillabam ñ uidetur per sistolen facere qui 393 1 dicit uua (passa *supra*) 2 dicit induruuit 3 est) *om.* 5 praeceptores) *om.* barbarismos adnumerant 6 explicabitur (mus *in marg.*) 8 quod d(c *supra*)um alii negent aiunt enim 9 sentimus 10 putet 12 interdum ut etiam

syllabarum numero peccet) *om. add. in marg.* 13 nam aut unum detrachat 14 prolatis est 15 incedat probandū (a *supra*)m sufficient 16 ut) *om.* 17 fecit 18 fecerat 19 uult 20 cum q. breb(v *supra*)is 23 uidetur at ille merebitur 26 corripit 27 barbarismus(est *supra*) 30 prius (*corr. in marg.*) 34 barbarum sonent 35 moytacismos et lautacismos 36 uitium) *om.* redigere 394, 2 pinguis 3 literis tribus sed in 4 est) *om.* pauca) *om. add. in marg.* dici(e *supra*)mus 5 aliqua 6 uocalis an ad sequentem) *om.* 9 sonet alia ut et si 12 prolatum sit 13 refferentes 15 aliquantum de priore 16 proferunt ut uidet 17 in h. (tr*supra*)erit sonus eius 18 ire pingior dissint 19 quiddam (*om. sonum*) producta est uel acutior uel plenior 21 autem) *om.* debet) *om.* 22 possunt) *om. add. in marg.* 23 a) *om.* 24 eferatur 24 re uera insitum alterutrum 25 eferunt. ut enim dicat 26 11) *om.* 27 est) *om.* 27, 28 iter illud ego 28 eripui) *om.* 28 consonanti 29 quod est romanae linguae 30 habent in hac plenius 31 ut in balbo 32 algam 33 p ut culpe (sulpo *in marg.*) 33 autem(*supra*) 395 1 exempla) *om.* 2 quorundam 3 nationum) *om.* 4 infringat 6 sona(n *supra*)t admiscant 7 in quibusdam) *add. in marg.*) non// (in *eras.*) 8, 9 si dicat 9 orationis parte 14 per: exiliter 15 dicere (eos *in marg.*) aestimes 21 in motu etiam quicquid) *om. add. in marg.* citiore aut quis¹) *om.* 23 ob) *om.* 24 mediocri se 25 in) *om.* 26 sunt maxime haec 27 de actione 28 solō est quidem illa 29 est) *om.* pluribus(*supra*) 30 altius est intellegere. Nam ecce qui dicat nominatiuus cassus fontis 31 dicere fons 34 uel generis 35 ipsum solum 36 discutietur 396 1 uitium fit) *om.* 2 quae) *om.* 2 singulis partibus sunt imperite facta ibi barbarismus erit 3 et cum 4 est) *om.* 6 quadrigam sordem paces) plu 7² est autem 8 nu(a *supra*)mqui casu) *om.* 9 et dentis) *om.* 11 dici melius) *om.* 12 nullo tempore (*corr. in marg.*) 13 qd non 15 uel syllabae) *om.* 16, 17 in barbarismo et barbarolexi 18 peccet 19 ex) *om.* 20 quia) *om.* 21 dici non potest in) *om.* 22 sit solocismus 22 regularum habita quod prolatio talis peccet 24 una dictio 27 litterae 29 partis dicantur 31 orationum 31 nam et barbarismus 32 pronuntiet 34 et) *om.* 35 item

¹ So too M. In B the cross stroke of the t of peccat, which is at the end of a line, is as often in that position, slightly prolonged and turned up at the end: which rather suggests "peccatur" as the right reading.

² Autem is written in the well known Irish contraction; so this is a clear instance of the confusion of the contracted form of enim and autem.

ad(p *supra*)se pro re ipsa 35 transmotabimus 397 i coniecimus
 licet et parelicon 2 adesdum (adesteum *in marg.*) 3 tropus
 magis 4 motamus 8 alterius syllā 9 diacope (*marg.* diaere-
 sis) 10 habet 11 satias " titoy pro satietas (*marg.* " antiton)
 duae) *om.* 12 subortae 13 couaclam 14 facit barbarismum
 v (*supra*) 15 et per inmotationem 16 motauit item) *om.* 17
 duo barbarismi) *om.* (et duo barb. *in marg.*). 18, 19 cern-
 untur - orationis) *om.* *add. in marg.* (geruntur *pro* cernuntur).
 19 est) *om.* 20 metaplasmsus dēprēhēndi quale dicunt esse
 illud 21 quod. fa. syll. quae erat lingua 22 in) *om.* 23 q:
 alioqui plu semper numeri fit 24 itaque ///et 26 maiore uitio
 27 despiciendo 28 dicunt esse 29 corrupta iam) *om.* 31
 habet (*add. in marg.*) 31 dicitur) *om.* 32 ostenda 34 gratia)
 causa 398, 1 plane) *om.* 2 barbarismi (*in marg.*) possis 3
 tirancidas dicant (pro *supra*) 4, hii sed in sensu) *om.* 5 sangui-
 nitos (*om.* pro sanguineis) 7 contra id quod ut agere putent
 10 est) *om.* 23 sua apte (aperte *in marg.*) a) *om.* 26 refugit
 28 aeneaē 29 artibus aut consuetudinibus 31 intigri enuntiati sunt
 33 ex) *om.* 34 et) *om.* 36 nunc poni 399 i sufficient plenius)
om. 2 debeat) *om.* cuncta figurantur 3 et taedet 8 o mihi prae-
 teritos referat si) *om.* 9 magno quod lae dyptongus 10 sit eolae
 11 alexin cum 12 sit cum o alioqui lingua sit 13 cum) *om.* 13, 14
 alibi longa sit ut pecodes 15 auroque refulgere (effulgere *in marg.*)
 18 currus consonis literis sequentibus 19 alioqui hisdem 21 sit
 cum te longum duae consonae efficerint item defenditur hoc erat
 23 consonante 24 alioqui 25 zancitus sequenti duplici z breui
 26 longa habeatur ut exsultat amzon 27 praeteritos refferat si
 ioppiter annos, cur hi ut est 28 ferro) *om.* 30 supradictum dixi
 32 continguet paucis 400 2 positos) *om.* 3 aut) *om.* 5 corruptam
 relinquunt 6 danaium tanton (*om.* et) dixisti 7 1 per meta-
 plasmum item contra lucius atque ore corrupto 11 haec cum
 eueniunt 13 a poeta sic 14 corrumperint 15 corrumpere
 eam 18 labantes 20 poterunt 22 sistole aut iectasis. similis
 ratio erit in dieresi 23 et quod lucanus 25 uocari et item 27 per-
 suasserit. synaliphe et eclipsis 9 ut) ac 401 1 quibus modis
 2 euenire synalipha (*et sic saepe*) una siue ex uno uocali siue ex
 4, 5 sunt haec 6 femine solum) *om.* 7 diplodit 8 hic (*supra*)
 9 ieciens superfluo duabus ostendit (*corr. in obstent al. m.*)
 11 conseretur 13 est) *ante* ergo 16 mundi sol aureus astra) *om.*
 17, 18 diuersa est item eius potestas 18 dyptongon 19 feminae
 ardentem est. Item eius potestatis ut 20 cum muta 22 potestatis

23 primum) plurimum 23 ut est atque 25 reffert quum excluderis
 25, 26 ea dubitatio euenit 31 eaci transiluisti quae ex gi (*marg.*
 ci) putius nos exclusa est (sicut cum scandas coniugi ci ectlimsis
 erit exclusa *in marg.*) diptongos et quasi expressa 402 1
 sic) *om.* 2 accipio gnos ectlipsis est talis est feminae 3 potest
 scandere femin arden et erit sinalipha item potes feminaerdentem
 5 incertum est sinalipha 8 manifesto 9 et ex difinitionibus et
 exemplis ipsis qđ hii 11 etiam a scriptoribus 13 ille eteris
 14 si mult. facias 15 dicit ex 16 tanton et tantone 17 magi
 multum ille erit cum muta 18 uelud (*et alias*) 19 est) *om.*
 20 iam pene uno neque id ad 21 suffecit 22 interest quae res
 quo dummodo) dum 23 uelud in manu in dispectione 25
 horum duorum discernit 27 a poetis 28 latinost (*e supra*
al. m.) 29 utique) *om.* 30 fecerimus 30 relinquisset 32 reliqueri-
 (n *supra*) t nobis scandendi potestas 34 ille terris 35 possimus 36
 qđ sum h ut ostenderimus 403 1 corrumpundae 3 relin-
 quetur nunc nobis 4 integra legitur quem 5 possumus animad-
 uertamus metaplasma: sicut 6 aut literam uocalem excludit
 7 ex) *om.* et muta aut 8 ut est hic enim rastra 9 est) *om.*
 9 adieci 11 duae mutae periunt 12, 13 arethusa ut scandamus
 14 rasty. his IIII modis 15 quicquid illud 15-17 positum sit—
 uocales) *om.* 18 diuersa uel consonantem 19 ea) *om.* 21 perit e)
om. inter consonantem 22 et puerum Astianacta) *om.* 23 regit.
 quod puerum Astyanacta trahebat inter 25 rostq. ea duos 27
 enim ghaslacri 31 regin especu 33 peri (a *supra*) t 33 et fit
 la. (ut *supra*) tua 35 adstrictius (ut *supra*) posterior periat
 dardani(o *supra*): 404 1 in syllabam unam (n *supra*) coeunt 2
 pluiasque hyadas ut scandamus asquea quam asquhya 3 inus-
 sitatis est post q et uy 7 metaplasma enim quem inuenimus
 ui in qua scribitur intuebimur. Finit.

Among spelling variations one of the commonest is the doubling
 of a consonant, a fault especially frequent in Irish MSS. Com-
 monest is the doubling of s, (e. g. cassus, ussus, possitus, expos-
 sitio, prothessis, sincrissis, conlissionem, excussatio, diernessis,
 dissillabum, siracussas): other instances are 'Terrentius', 'Affri',
 'reffert'. On the other hand molosus, Achilles, litera occur with
 a single consonant. E and i are very frequently confused (e. g.
 i for e in postrimus, siries, intigre, dirigo, difinitio, ditractio, dili-
 ciosa, consuetudo: e for i in cremen, emitur, deffero, accedens,
 perteneo). Communis and muto and its compounds are inua-
 riably spelled with an o (commonis, moto) also ioppiter, insola;

potius with an u: traho with a c inserted (e. g. subtrachitur): uersus with an o, with one exception and then o is written over e by the corrector: pinguius lacks its first u; and temno, damno, damnum suffer from the insertion of a p. Greek words are of course very hardly treated (e. g. auferesis, sinacope, ectlimpsis or ectlipsis, lautacismus). Ad and in are generally if not always left unassimilated when they form part of a compound word.

In conclusion I may mention that I have examined the Naples MS of Consentius' other work 'de nomine et uerbo', which is mentioned but not collated by Keil.¹ The barrenness of the work prevents me from more than cursorily alluding to it. The MS is more nearly related to Keil's B and L than to M, especially to B; indeed it seems to have been copied from a MS closely akin to B and corrected from one resembling L and the MS used by Sichard: e. g. 354 29 sed et hic euphoniae M, sed et hic etiam euphoniae B, sed et haec eadem euphoniae LS, sed et hi(e-supra)c eadem euphoniae N (eadem being added by the corrector in a space left by the first hand).

341 20 aries which is omitted by BM, but occurs in LS, is in N inserted in the margin.

366 26 uerba sunt ut ait Probus S, uerba sunt ut B. In L and M the words 'ait Probus' are omitted; in N 'sunt ut ait Probus' is added in the margin.

368 27 N reads 'aliter //tonderi ////cura(n supra)t uellera non (enim supra) posset dici //tonderi ////uellera cura(n supra)t', the first reading apparently being closest to B and the correction to S.

367 5 appellata dicuntur B, appellata sunt M, sunt appellata L. N appears to have read dicuntur but it is erased and sunt written in the space.

380 16 N reads 'euenit mihi tibi illi', with L S.

E. O. WINSTEDT.

¹Since writing this article I find that an older MS of part of this work has been discovered at Milan (cod. Ambros. B 71 sup.). A full collation of it is given by R. Salbadini, Spogli Ambrosiani Latini (Studi Italiani di Filologia classica vol. XI p. 240). It is of the 9th cent.: and like the Naples MS. supports B and L rather than M.

III.—ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE VOCATIVE.

LYRIC POETS.

The *ῥθος* of the interjection with the vocative in the Lyric Poets is much the same as in Homer,¹ and denotes impatience, familiarity, or lack of reserve. The sphere of familiarity is extended so as, rarely however, to include the gods, and the use is wider. Taking the Lyric Poets as given in Hiller, also Pindar, Bacchylides, and Timotheus, the vocative is used with the interjection 184 times, with it omitted, 461 times. That is, the interjection is used with but 28% of the vocatives. In general, those poets who are most familiar in tone use the interjection most. Theognis in the first Eleg. omits the interjection 123 times and uses it but 5; while the coarser Eleg. B has the interjection 17 times and omits it but 7. Alcaeus, Anacreon, the Scholia, and the Carmina Popularia have the interjection with nearly 60% of the vocatives, while Stesichorus with 4 vocatives has no interjection, and Alcman has but one in 11, and that one *ὦ ὁλεῖ δαίμων*, frag. 79, reveals the tone. Pindar has 65 in 205. Where Pindar is most stately he is very sparing of the interjection. In the First Olympian "Pindar is consciously treading a lofty measure", and so although there are five vocatives, there are no interjections, while the Sixth Isthmian, of a very different *ῥθος*, has the same number of vocatives, each with *ὦ*. Pindar assumes a peculiar attitude towards the Muses, and regards them as his own familiar friends. He is the first Greek poet to say *ὦ Μοῖσα* or *ὦ Μοῖσαι*. Although the Muses are addressed 16 times by others of the Lyric Poets, the vocatives *Μοῦσα* and *Μοῦσαι* are never used with the interjection by them, Pindar is the only Lyric Poet who uses *ὦ* in speaking to the Muses; cf. O. 10, 3; 11, 18; N. 3, 1; I. 6, 57. This presumption of Pindar's did not escape the notice of Aristophanes who in his parody of Pindar departs from his own usual custom and says *ὦ Μοῦσα*, Av. 905. For the proofs that this is a parody on Pindar, see Scholiast and Kock on Av. 905.

A striking proof of the familiar tone of the interjection is the fact that in addresses to the *παιδικά* it is always used.

¹ See A. J. P. XXIV, 192 ff. and XXV, 81 ff.

The single exception to this, among 21 examples, is Theog. 1249, where this vocative coming in a series of vocatives, each with the interjection, hardly violates the rule. Similar is Pindar's δ παῖδες, Frag. 122, 6 addressed to the courtesans of Corinth. At the other extreme lie the dignified patronymics which do not take the interjection. Theog. 25, 57, 61, 79, 129, 143, 191, 377, 541, 738, 1197; Alcman 7a; Archil. 7, 1; 76, 1; Sol. 19, 3; Anacreon 103; Pind. P. 1, 71; 5, 45, 118; 9, 30; N. 7, 70; 9, 28; 10, 76. In the four places where the patronymic takes an interjection, the reserve implied in the form of the word is lost in the tone of the whole. Arch. 96, 1, δ Κηρυκίδη· ἀχρυμένη σκυτάλη. Alcaeus 76 is of a similar tone. In Anac. 74, δ ῥιστοκλείδη, πρῶτον οἰκτίρω φίλων, the patronymic is used in pity, hence the interjection, and the other example, Simon. 98, is in the last words of a dying son to his father, and is certainly familiar.

In the speech of the gods the interjection is not used, cf. Hipponax 25, Pind. O. 6, 62, 13, 67, P. 9, 30. The one exception is where Aphrodite uses the extremely familiar 'ὦ Ψάπφ', Sappho I, 20.

Taken as a whole, the only conclusion for the Lyric Poets is that the vocative ordinarily does not have the interjection, and that the interjection, when used, indicates a throwing off of reserve, either to denote stress, familiarity, or emotion.

HERODOTUS.

The use of the interjection in Herodotus is strikingly similar to that of Sophocles, and the proportions are exactly the same, as each uses the interjection with 60% of the vocatives. The exact number for Herodotus, omitting the oracles, is vocative with δ 171, without δ 116. He too uses the interjection with participles, with adjectives used as substantives, and in appeals to the inanimate; and like Sophocles, he does not use the interjection with proper names of persons. The vocative of proper names of persons is used without δ 47 times, with it but twice. The rough speech of Adeimantus to Themistocles, VIII, 59, δ Θεμιστόκλεες ἐν τοῖσι ἀγῶσι οἱ προσβανιστάμενοι ῥαπτίζονται, is certainly unusual both in its thought and manner. In I 32, Solon twice uses the interjection in reply to the impatient and vexed Croesus, Κροῖσος δὲ σπερχθεις εἶπε. With no violations of this rule in Aesch. or Soph. and these two out of 49 in Her., it is evident that the omission of δ is no accident, and that the familiar tone of the interjection was

out of place with proper names of persons. "Sir Walter" is the English equivalent for the vocative without the interjection, "Walter" for the vocative with it. Exactly in keeping with this is the fact that before such expressions as *ἄνδρες σύμμαχοι*, *ἄνδρες στρατιῶται*, *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι* the interjection is not used, while with *ἄνδρες* omitted in names of peoples, the interjection is always used. I, 125, *ὦ Πέρσαι*, but 126, *ἄνδρες Πέρσαι*; VIII, 140, *ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι*, but *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*; IX, 26, *ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι*, but *ἄνδρες Σπαρτιῆται*. Herodotus has 38 examples of this use of *ἄνδρες*, I, 126, III, 71, 73, 83, 137. IV, 3, 98, 133, 136, 139, 158, V, 91, 98, 109. VI, 9, 11, 85, 97, 130. VII, 8, 13, 135, 150, 158, 172, VIII, 22, 24, 118, 140, IX, 9, 21, 26, 45, 60, 82, 87, 89, 98. The only one of all these that has the interjection is IX, 89, where the fleeing Artabazus says *ὦ ἄνδρες Θεσσαλοί*. The use of the interjection here may be intended to picture his perplexity, or his coarseness.

Sophocles also always omits the interjection in the use of kindred expressions, Ajax, 565, *ἄνδρες ἀσπιστῆρες*, 719, *ἄνδρες φίλοι* O. R. 512, *ἄνδρες πολῖται*, O. C. 1579, *ἄνδρες πολῖται*.

These two classes, the vocative of proper names of persons, and phrases with *ἄνδρες*, cover about three-fourths of the vocatives without the interjection in Herodotus.

These two following examples from the words of Croesus show well the distinction between the vocative without the interjection, and the vocative with it. I, 30, when Croesus wishes to flatter Solon, and to be flattered by him he says, *Ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, παρ' ἡμέας γὰρ περὶ σέο λόγος ἀπικται πολλὸς καὶ σοφίης τῆς σῆς καὶ πλάνης κτλ.* but when the reply provokes him he says, *ὦ ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, ἡ δ' ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονία οὕτω τοι ἀπέρριπται ἐς τὸ μηδέν, ὥστε οὐδὲ ἰδιωτέων ἀνδρῶν ἀξίους ἡμέας ἐποίησας*; and it is in reply to this that Solon uses the only interjection used with the proper name of a person, except the taunt of Adeimantus to Themistocles quoted above.

Hence also the familiar family greetings such as father, mother, wife, son, and daughter have the interjection; cf. I, 37, 38, 39, 40, 111, 121. III, 3, 50, 52, 53, 69, 119 (bis) 134 (bis). V, 19 bis. VI, 68, 69 (bis). VII, 16, β. No exceptions to this rule.

EURIPIDES.

The percentage of vocatives with the interjection is lower in Euripides than in Sophocles and Herodotus. The exact figures for Euripides are, omitting the fragments, vocatives with interjection 1144, without 971. The interjection is used with 54 per

cent of the vocatives in Euripides, with 60 per cent in Sophocles and Herodotus.

The rules for the use of the interjection are:

I. The vocative of the participle, when used without the noun or when the noun is used in apposition to the participial phrase must have the interjection. As there are about one hundred examples of this use, I shall illustrate from Nauck's first and last plays, *The Alcestis* and *Phoenissae*.

Alcestis, 407, ὦ σχέτλια δὴ παθὼν
625, ὦ τόνδε μὲν σώσας,
697, ὦ κάκισθ' ἡσσημένος
837, ὦ πολλὰ τλᾶσα

Phoenissae, 1, ὦ τὴν ἐν ἄστροις οὐρανοῦ τέμνων ὁδὸν

Ἥλιε.—Here Ἥλιε is in apposition to the participial phrase.

84. ὦ φαεινὰς οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχὰς

Ζεῦ.—Example of the same use as the preceding.

Other examples of the interjection with the participle in this play are 226, 298, 310, 580, 917, 1270, 1436, 1447, 1536. Since the interjection is not used with the unmodified names of persons, and since it is always used with the participle, the translation of such a vocative as is found in *Iph. Taur.* 17:

ὦ τῆσδ' ἀνάσσων Ἑλλάδος στρατηγίας
'Αγάμεμνον,

is not "O Agamemnon, thou who dost wield the military power of Hellas" but "O thou who dost wield the military power of Hellas, thou Agamemnon". A more intricate example is *Phoen.* 580:

ὦ κακὰ μνηστεύματα
Ἄδραστε προσθείς,

which is not "O Adrastus, thou who didst press baneful wooings" but "O thou who didst press baneful wooings, thou Adrastus". Liddell and Scott miss the point entirely, by translating it "oh baneful spousals" thus removing the interjection from the participle, and changing an accusative to the vocative.

II. In addresses to the inanimate, especially to parts of the body, as *χείρ*, *χρῶς*, *πούς* and similar words, or in addresses to implements or parts of the house, the interjection is not omitted.

The large number of examples under this rule makes it impossible to illustrate from more than two plays.

Alcestis, 1, ὦ δώματ' Ἀδμήτει

177, ὦ λείκτρον

234, ὦ Φεραία χθών, also 569, 837, 861, 895, 911, 1133.

Phoen. 88, 182, 191, 226, 256, 613, 629, 678, 801, 818, 884, 1019, 1290, 1342, 1500, 1595, 1701, 1702, 1764. The only one of these which does not have the interjection is Phoen. 629, καὶ τί σοι, πόλις, where the interjection was not used because of the preceding σοί. The apparent exception in Alcestis 248 is due to the fact that the words are part of an appeal beginning with a name of the god Ἄλκιε and so the interjection need not be used, as the initial word of the series gives the tone to the whole. There are but few exceptions to this rule in the other plays.

III. When the first syllable of the third foot in trimeter is a monosyllabic vocative the interjection must be used.

Alcestis 509, χαῖρ', ὦ Διὸς παῖ

539, οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦναξ, The last word here is treated as a true monosyllable.

Phoen. 154, εἴη τάδ', ὦ παῖ.

1432, ὅμοξεν' ὦ τέκν'

1703, νῦν χρησμός, ὦ παῖ,

Euripides has sixty examples of this use of the interjection. The only exceptions are the following, El. 1238, I. A. 1405, I. T. 1158, 1474, each having Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖ, Phoen. 532, Φιλοτιμίας, παῖ; Rhesus 669, Λαερτίου παῖ, 916, Φιλάμμωνος παῖ. In each of these exceptions the first two feet are made up of a single word, and the insertion of the interjection in the verse is impossible. There are no other exceptions.

IV. An adjective used in the vocative without a noun regularly has the interjection.

Alcestis 144, ὦ τλήμον, 250, ὦ τάλαινα, 258, ὦ δύσδαιμον, 460, ὦ μόνα, 717, ὦ κάκιστ', 741, ὦ γενναία καὶ μέγ' ἀρίστη, 824, ὦ σχέτλι'.

Phoen. 124, 171, 884, 1072, 1671. No exception to this rule in the Alcestis or the Phoenissae. Some of the other plays have rare exceptions.

Repeated vocatives such as τέκνα τέκνα, ὦ δόμος δόμος do not differ in the use of the interjection from the single form. These repeated forms are comparatively rare in Euripides, and as far as the vocative is concerned, do not bear out the note of Weck-

lein to Phoen. 819, "Diese Wiederholung des Wortes ist eine dem Euripides eigentümliche Weise lyrischen Ausdrucks".

Three of the plays have no repeated vocative, viz. H. F. Suppl. I. T., while no play of Sophocles is without them. Sophocles in seven plays has nineteen repeated vocatives, while Euripides in nineteen plays has but thirty. Sophocles not only uses these repeated vocatives more freely than Euripides, but is much bolder in the words used. Euripides has a parallel to O. R. 1403, ὦ γάμοι γάμοι, in Androm. 1186, and to O. R. 629, ὦ πόλις πόλις in Androm. 1211, but he has nothing to match Trach. 1089, ὦ χέρες χέρες, nor Phil. 1188, ὦ πούς πούς. About one-half of all these repeated vocatives in Euripides are put in the mouth of Hecuba.

In the Teubner edition of Aeschylus there are twenty such repeated vocatives, so that Aeschylus uses them more often than Sophocles or Euripides. The Agamemnon has more repeated vocatives than any other Greek tragedy.

V. Class terms such as πρόσπολοι, δμῶες, ὀπαδοί, and all words denoting slaves or servants, have the vocative without ὦ, unless said by one servant to another.

Androm. 426, δμῶες, and also in 715.

Bacchae 1217, πρόσπολοι.

Hec. 1282, δμῶες.

Hel. 1170, δμῶες, 1181, ὀπαδοί, 1391, δμῶες.

El. 360, ὀπαδοί, 394, δμῶες, 851, παλαιοὶ δμῶες, 960, δμῶες, 1135, ὀπάονες.

Her. 1050, δμῶες, 1053, ὀπαδοί.

H. F. 724, πρόσπολοι.

Sup. 1115, ἀμφίπολοι.

Hip. 108, ὀπαδοί, 200, πρόσπολοι. 808, πρόσπολοι. 1084, 1184, 1358, δμῶες.

I. A. 1340, δμῶες, I. T. 638, πρόσπολοι, also 1205.

Ion, 510, πρόσπολοι, 666, δμωίδες, 1250, πρόσπολοι.

Medea, 1314, πρόσπολοι. Orestes 629, πρόσπολοι, 1380, Ἑλένης πρόσπολ'.

Rhesus 804, ἡνίοχε, Tro. 295, δμῶες, 880, ὀπάονες. While free persons kept slaves at a distance and did not address them with the interjection, slaves could use to each other the familiar ὦ. Androm. 64, ὦ φιλάτη σύνδουλε, Ion, 1109, ὦ σύνδουλε. This rule is not violated by Aesch. Cf. Ag. 908, δμωαί, Choeph. 84, δμωαί

γυναῖκες. 719, δμωίδες οἰκων. Compare also Soph. Antig. 578, δμῶες, 1108, ὑπάονες. 1214, πρόσπολοι, Trach. 1264, ὑπαδοί.

The use of the interjection in O. R. 945 is a fine touch.

Iocasta. τί δ'; οὐχ ὁ πρέσβυς Πόλυβος ἐγκρατὴς ἔτι;

Messenger. οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεὶ νυν θάνατος ἐν τάφοις ἔχει,

Iocasta. ὦ πρόσπολ', οὐχὶ δεσπότη τὰδ' ὥς τάχος|μολοῦσα λέξεις;
Iocasta in her ecstasy of joy pays no thought to class distinctions, and so uses ὦ before πρόσπολος, the only example in the extant Greek tragedies.

Sophocles has one example of ἰώ with the vocative of a word denoting servitude, but the speaker has absolutely renounced himself and his authority.

Antigone 1320. Creon. ἐγὼ γάρ σ' ἐγὼ ἔκανον, ὦ μέλεος,
ἐγὼ, φάμ' ἔτυμον. ἰὼ πρόσπολοι,
ἄγετέ μ' ὅ τι τάχιστ', ἄγετέ μ' ἐκποδών,
τὸν οὐκ ὄντα μᾶλλον ἢ μηδένα.

Here there can be no thought of class distinctions, and the interjection deepens the tone of self-abandonment and despair. As this rule is not confined to tragedy, but belongs to the common speech also, as will be shown later, it seems to me that the interjection denotes a degree of familiarity beyond that allowed to servants in their intercourse with their masters.

VI. In addresses to persons present the interjection is never added to an unmodified proper name.

Not once in Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Euripides does a single example occur of an unmodified proper name of a person used in the vocative with an interjection. There are 255 examples of this rule in Euripides, and a large number in Aeschylus and Sophocles. The interjection must have added here a certain familiar tone too undignified for tragedy. Euripides gives the very examples needed to illustrate this, Cyclops 539, where the Cyclops addresses Silenus with ὦ Σεληνέ, and he himself is addressed as ὦ Κύκλωψ by Silenus 262. It seems that there must be something in the tone of the interjection, and not an accident that Euripides should address none of his characters by an unmodified name with the interjection, save only Cyclops and Silenus. I do not count Silenus and Cyclops as real persons; hence this is no exception. I. A. 573, the chorus say ὦ Πάρις,

but he is not present, and the same applies to Hel. 1220, Phoen. 1494, and Helen is hardly present, Hel. 1120.

These are not exceptions, as an absent person can be addressed in any desired manner without the tone seeming to him too familiar.

VII. The use of several vocatives in succession with the interjection denotes great excitement, the use of a series without the interjection gives a feeling of calmness or composure. Hence a change from vocatives with the interjection to vocatives without them shows that the speaker has fixed his purpose and gained self-mastery, while the change from vocatives without the interjection to vocatives with *o* shows loss of self-control.

From many examples of this I select two. Hippolytus, 902 ff. Theseus in wildest anger accosts his son for his supposed attempted crime, while the son with perfect calmness answers him, until the depravity and baseness of Phaedra is forced upon him, then from calmness he changes to the wildest passion and despair. During the time when Hippolytus is master of himself, he uses seven vocatives, not one with the interjection, while every one the father uses has *o*. With verse 1060 the baseness of it all comes to him, and in the verses immediately following he uses seven vocatives, each with the interjection. The shift from vocative without the interjection to vocative with interjection exactly corresponds to the change in his self-control.

The other illustration is Iphigenia in Aulis 864 ff. Here the real purpose for which Iphigenia is brought to Aulis is found out, and the excitement and anguish is reflected in the vocatives, all of which until 999 have the interjection, finally after struggling, Iphigenia resolves to die, and gains complete control of herself, so that she tells her purpose to her mother 1368 ff., and in the speech which follows she uses four vocatives, not one of which has the interjection.

On the whole, in Euripides the interjection adds familiarity or passion, the absence of the interjection gives a tone of calmness, distance, or reserve.

ARISTOPHANES.

With Aristophanes there is a decided increase in the use of the interjection with the vocative. The interjection is used with 1000 and omitted with 252 vocatives, that is, it is used with 80% of the vocatives.

Most of the cases of omitted interjection fall under five heads.

1) Poetic reminiscence or parody, e. g. Knights 1015 and 1030 Ἐρεχθεΐδη, 1055 Κεκροπίδη, 1067 Αἰγείδη. Here, as in Homer and the Lyric Poets, the patronymic is used without the interjection. Peace 736, θύγατερ Διός, 775, 816 Μοῦσα. and often in other plays.

2) Avoidance of cacophony after an "ω" in the preceding syllable. The Acharnians has the following examples, 53, 95, 414, 452, 777, 887; so in other plays.

3) In phrases such as ἄνδρες δημόται the interjection is generally omitted, Achar. 328, ἄνδρες δημόται, Knights 242, ἄνδρες ἱππῆς, Wasps 908, ἄνδρες δικασταί. Peace 9, ἄνδρες κοπρολόγοι. [Here the omission of the interjection adds to the mock elevation.] Peace 500 ἄνδρες Μεγαρής, Lys. 1074, 1122. ἄνδρες Λάκωνες. The interjection is used in such expressions but 4 times, Achar. 56, Clouds 1437, Peace 292, Plutus 322. The emotion which the interjection adds to this phrase is shown by the passage in the Acharnians, 56, ὦνδρες πρυτάνεις, ἀδικεῖτε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κτλ.

4) In an address to a slave παῖ always omits the interjection, while the interjection is never omitted when παῖ is addressed to a free person, unless modifying words show that the person meant is free.

This use I shall illustrate by the Clouds, as typical of all the plays. Strepsiades calls to the slave, 18, παῖ, λύχνον. but to his son 87, ὦ παῖ, πιθοῦ μοι. to the porter 132, παῖ, παιδίον. 1144, παῖ, ἡμί, παῖ παῖ. Cf. also 614 to a slave μὴ πρίην, παῖ, δᾶδ', 1165, ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ, to Pheidippides. In the Frogs 190, when Dionysus calls out παῖ, δεῦρο, Charon at once replies δοῦλον οὐκ ἄγω, as the use of παῖ alone revealed the slave. Later when the arrival at Hades shifted the relations, Dionysus said, 437, ὦ παῖ. In the Acharnians 1136 after Lamachus has shouted παῖ to his slave ten times, in perplexity he calls ὦ παῖ, which by itself would show his confusion, even if βαβαιάξ' χειμέρια τὰ πράγματα did not follow. [As this rule is even more striking in Plato, the reason for omitting the interjection in calling to a slave will be discussed in the study of Plato.]

5) The interjection is often omitted to give a certain reserve, dignity, or elevation, either actual or in mockery: e. g. Knights 242, 551, 634, 1253.

The following table will show that those plays which have the least elevation have the lowest percentage of vocatives without the interjection, while those with most parody of tragedy and most mock or actual elevation have the most vocatives without ὦ.

	Without ω	With ω	Percentage of voc. with ω
Knights	12	101	89+
Peace	16	129	89—
Clouds	13	95	88
and at the other extreme			
Frogs	40	72	64
Thes.	40	86	68
Birds	21	82	81

The Knights, perhaps, comes nearest to the common familiar speech, and so has the fewest vocatives without the interjection. The 12 vocatives without ω are as follows, three patronymics quoted above, three dignified appeals, one to the Knights, 242, one to the heliasts, 266, one to the βουλή, 654, two lofty appeals to the gods, 551 ἵππ' ἄναξ Πόσειδον, 1253 Ἑλλάνιε Ζεῦ, σὸν τὸ νικητήριον. One epic parody 634, where the mock elevation is made more striking by the omission of the interjection:

ἄγε δὴ Σκίταλοι καὶ Κόβαλοι καὶ Μόθων, κτλ.

One 786, pictures the awe with which the Sausage-seller is regarded:

ἄνθρωπε, τίς εἶ; μὲν ἔκγονος εἶ τῶν Ἀρμοδίου τίς ἐκείνων;

One is a mock dignified appeal to Demos.

1207, τί οὐ διακρίνεις, Δῆμ'. And the last of the twelve vocatives without ω is addressed to slaves, 418 παῖδες, so no interjection.

Every time the vocative is used without the interjection in the Knights, it is in an expression of reserve or mock elevation.

For Aristophanes the only conclusion is, the more elevated his style, the less he uses the interjection, while the nearer his language approaches to the common vulgar speech, the more is ω used with the vocative.

PLATO.

There is but one important exception to the rule that in Plato the vocative has the interjection. Everywhere a slave is addressed as παῖ the interjection is omitted; while a similar address to a free person never omits the interjection. The slave is addressed Theaet. 143 C. ἀλλά, παῖ, λαβὲ τὸ βιβλίον καὶ λέγε, but Socrates always addresses Theaetetus as ω παῖ, 145 D. 151 E. 156 A. 158 A. 200 C. Symposium 175 A, to a slave, οὐ σκέψῃ, παῖ, καὶ εἰσάξεις Σωκράτη; 213 E, φέρε, παῖ, τὸν ψυκτῆρα, and in the plural 212 D,

παῖδες, οὐ σκέψασθε; 213 B, ὑπολύετε, παῖδες, Ἀλκιβιάδην. Charmides 155 B, to a slave, παῖ, κάλει Χαρμίδην. In two places where slaves are not treated as slaves the interjection is used. In Meno, where Socrates is teaching geometry to Meno's slave, he treats him not as a slave but a pupil, hence always the interjection, 82 B, 83 C, 85 B. In Symposium 175 B. Agathon says ἀλλ' ἡμᾶς, ὦ παῖδες, τοὺς ἄλλους ἐστιᾶτε. πάντως παρατίθετε ὃ τι ἂν βούλησθε, ἐπειδὴν τις ὑμῖν μὴ ἐφεστῆκη ὃ ἐγὼ οὐδεπώποτε ἐποίησα· νῦν οὖν, νομίζοντες καὶ ἐμὲ ὑφ' ὑμῶν κεκληῆσθαι κτλ. Here the relation of master and slave is abandoned, and Agathon definitely annuls the relation by the use of the interjection. Outside of the drunken discourse of Alcibiades in the Symposium there are too few examples of the vocative without the interjection to change the rule that, with the exception of addresses to slaves, the vocative always has the interjection. Twenty dialogues, including Republic, Protagoras, Theaetetus, Parmenides, have no exceptions.

The slave was excluded from the interjection simply because it was too familiar, and to use it would have violated Plato's own precept, Laws 778, τὴν δὲ οἰκέτου πρόσρησιν χρὴ σχεδὸν ἐπίταξιν πᾶσαν γίγνεσθαι, μὴ προσπαίζοντας μηδαμῇ μηδαμῶς οἰκέταις.

CONCLUSION.

The use of the interjection increased steadily with each sphere of literature from Homer to Plato. With Plato it became almost universal.

In Homer the interjection was not used in prayers or in passages of dignity and elevation, but was freely used in the scenes at the hut of Eumaeus, and where Odysseus returned to his home in the guise of a beggar. In Lyric Poetry the interjection is most congenial to the drinking songs and the Carmina Popularia. In Aristophanes those plays which are least removed from the common people, as the Knights and the Peace, have the most vocatives with the interjection, and even in these plays the omissions are found in scenes of mock or actual elevation. The nearer literature drew to the language of the common people, the more the interjection was used. Evidently ὦ belonged to the sermo vulgaris and hence was too familiar to be used in lofty scenes by Homer or the Lyric Poets.

The interjection with the vocative was familiar, and was not freely used until the familiar language of comedy, dialectic, and

the law courts became the language of literature, when the vocative rarely appears without the interjection.¹

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.

¹In the New Testament the interjection has practically vanished. In the four Gospels there are but three examples of *ὦ* with the vocative. *ὦ γυνὴ ἀπίστος*, Matth. XVII, 17; Mark IX, 19; Luke IX, 41. *ὦ ἄνθρωποι καὶ βραδεῖς*, Luke XXIV, 25. and *ὦ γύναι* Matth. XV, 28. in each case the words of Jesus. Here the vocative has returned to the strictest Homeric use. No prayers have the interjection.

IV.—SENECA THE PHILOSOPHER AND HIS THEORY OF STYLE.

It has been maintained, and without dissent, that the statements of Seneca on the subject of style cannot be reduced to a system, that they are inconsistent in important particulars with each other, that they differ from the writer's own practice to such an extent as to betray insincerity, and that they give evidence of a lack of settled judgment.¹ The severity of the criticism is intensified by the fact that what is made the object of such extreme censure was written by Seneca in the closing years of a long literary career. This very fact, however, together with the rigor of the judgment in itself, is sufficient to justify misgivings with reference to conclusions not supported by convincing demonstration, and to make it desirable, especially as it is a question in which our estimate of the intellectual and moral worth of Seneca is in some degree involved, to subject the whole matter to a more careful examination than it has hitherto received. In undertaking this we shall attempt in the first place to interpret and systematize the pertinent material in the writings of Seneca and afterwards to consider in detail the criticisms which we have already indicated.

When Seneca characterizes (ep. 114, 7) the faulty style of Maecenas as a monstrosity ("orationis portentosissimae") and in defending the style of Fabianus (ep. 100, 5) calls attention to the fact that the words are not used contrary to their nature ("contra naturam suam posita"), he applies a criterion that lies at the foundation of all his ideas about writing. It is the principle that excellence of style,—which word we shall use in the simple sense of manner of expression,—results from employing language according to nature. This is only a special application of the fundamental principle of his philosophy. He adopted

¹ Cf. A. Gercke, *Seneca-Studien*, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, 22. Supplementband, Leipzig, 1896, S. 134 ff.; E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig, 1898, S. 307, 310; H. Peter, *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1901, S. 231.

without reserve and never tires of repeating the basic teaching of the Stoics that the highest good is to live according to nature (*de vita beata* 3, 3; *de otio* 5, 1; *ep.* 5, 4; etc.). He defines nature as divine reason implanted in the universe as a whole and in its parts (*de ben.* 4, 7, 1). There is no good, he says, without reason; reason follows nature; it is an imitation of nature (*ep.* 66, 39). Virtue is in accordance with nature (*ep.* 50, 8), all faults fight against nature (*ep.* 122, 5; 50, 8). This, then, the fountain-head of his habitual thinking, was the source also of the controlling idea in his theory of style.

Seneca's conception of what it is to follow nature in the use of language is clearly indicated in his criticism of the style of Maecenas, the monstrosity of which is illustrated by quotations and analyzed by an enumeration of the faults exemplified. The words, it is charged, are improperly put together, are flung down carelessly, are employed in a manner that conflicts with general usage. Complicated forms of expression and a wresting of words from their legitimate meaning are mentioned as characteristic of the same style, which is still further described as involved, wandering, full of license, drunk.¹ Summed up in this last epithet we find, as we might have expected, that a failure to write according to nature consists in disregarding the dictates of reason. All the other faults enumerated have the same cause. Even the assignment of a certain authority to general usage is a requirement resulting from the nature of speech, which does not have one fixed rule but changes with the age.²

This fundamental principle might be elucidated in one way or another by everything Seneca says on the subject of style. A few additional illustrations of its application will be sufficient. Disapproval of carelessness is further attested by praise of Fabianus, who avoiding this fault chose his words with care and employed them with brilliant effect, though taking them from the stock in common use, while at the same time he was free from

¹ *Ep.* 114, 7 *haec verba tam improbe structa, tam neglegenter abiecta, tam contra consuetudinem omnium posita ostendunt mores quoque non minus novos et praeavos et singulares fuisse.*—114, 8 *istae ambages compositionis, verba transversa*—;—124, 4 *videbis istaque eloquentiam ebrii hominis involutam et errantem et licentiae plenam.*—19, 9 *est ergo tanti ulla potentia, ut sit tibi tam ebrius sermo?*

² *Ep.* 114, 13 *adice nunc, quod oratio certam regulam non habet: consuetudo illam civitatis, quae numquam in eodem diu stetit, versat.*

anxiety.¹ He is acquitted also of going to another extreme. It is declared (ep. 100, 8) that his style is not low ("humilia"), as it seemed to Lucilius, and that it should be likened, not to a depression ("depressa"), but to a plain ("plana"). This fault of extremes, of exceeding the proper bound (cf. ep. 114, 14 "plus iusto"), is one in which in greater or less degree control of reason is lost, nature abandoned, and monstrosity produced. It is a fault to which attention is called by Seneca again and again. Thus he condemns a love of the old that revives an ancient and obsolete diction and a love of the new that unnecessarily originates words and forms;² a fondness for what is out of use that makes even the Twelve Tables a model, and a fondness for what is in use that descends even to the low, and over against this again, arising from a distaste for the necessary and common, an exclusive employment of the brilliant and sonorous and poetic, and a too bold and frequent use of metaphor;³ further, obscure brevity in broken-off sentences that require more to be understood than is expressed, leaving the thought to be in part suspected, and the opposite fault of saying more than is fit by dwelling too long upon the same idea, or by overstating it;⁴ on the one hand, bombast and a studied roughness that is mistaken for manly vigor and, on the other hand, weakness and a smoothness

¹ Ep. 100, 5 Fabianus non erat neglegens in oratione sed securus. itaque nihil invenies sordidum: electa verba sunt, non captata nec huius saeculi more contra naturam suam posita et inversa, splendida tamen, quamvis sumantur e medio.

² Ep. 114, 10 modo antiqua verba atque exsoleta revocat ac profert, modo fingit et ignota ac deflectit.

³ Ep. 114, 13 sq. multi ex alieno saeculo petunt verba, duodecim tabulas loquuntur, Gracchus illis et Crassus et Curio nimis culti et recentes sunt, ad Appium usque et Coruncanium redeunt. quidam contra, dum nihil nisi tritum et usitatum volunt, in sordes incidunt. utrumque diverso genere corruptum est, tam mehercules quam nolle nisi splendidis uti ac sonantibus et poeticis, necessaria atque in usu posita vitare. tam hunc dicam peccare quam illum: alter se plus iusto colit, alter plus iusto neglegit.—114, 1 quare aliqua aetas fuerit, quae translationis iure uteretur invecunde? —114, 10 pro cultu habetur audax translatio ac frequens.

⁴ Ep. 114, 1 quare alias sensus audaces et fidem egressi placuerint, alias abruptae sententiae et suspiciosae, in quibus plus intellegendum esset quam audiendum?—114, 11 sunt qui sensus praecidant et ex hoc gratiam sperent, si sententia penderit et audienti suspensionem sui fecerit. sunt qui illos detineant et porrigant.—114, 17 sic Sallustio vigente anputatae sententiae et verba ante expectatum cadentia et obscura brevis fuere pro cultu.

that resembles a musical composition.¹ The faults of Maecenas and similar writers, who consciously and intentionally abandon a right form of expression, are pictured in general as unnaturalness by comparison with the toilet of those who pluck out the beard all over or in parts, or clip closely and shave the lips only, or wear glaring cloaks or a transparent toga, being indifferent, if they can but attract attention (ep. 114, 21).

Turning from the ideal of expression to possible accomplishment, we discover again a close connection between Seneca's theory of style and his philosophy. The perfectly wise man, the man who follows nature absolutely, is so seldom seen as to be practically a myth (ep. 42). Following nature is an approximation varying in degree and kind with the individual. If, then, excellence in writing depends on conformity to nature, it follows that a man's style is determined by his character. And this is what Seneca teaches. He adopts as an expression of his own view the Greek proverb, modernized by Buffon, that a man's speech corresponds to his life, that the style is the man. Language, he says, expressing the same thought in another form, is the dress of the mind and the qualities of the one are like those of the other. This agreement of course is not a mere coincidence. The one thing is the cause of similarity in the other. And it is the character of the mind that determines the character of the style, whether good or bad. The drunkenness of speech is due to drunkenness of mind. It is from the mind that words proceed. If this is sound and strong, speech also is sturdy, strong, and manly.² Even great writers, not having attained perfect

¹ Ep. 114, 1 quare quibusdam temporibus provenerit corrupti generis oratio quaeris et quomodo in quaedam vitia inclinatio ingeniorum facta sit, ut aliquando inflata explicatio vigeret, aliquando infracta et in morem cantici ducta? —114, 15 ad compositionem transeamus. quot genera tibi in hac dabo, quibus peccetur? quidam praefractam et asperam probant. disturbant de industria, si quid placidius effluxit. nolunt sine salebra esse iuncturam. virilem putant et fortem, quae aurem inaequalitate percutiat. quorundam non est compositio, modulatio est: adeo blanditur et molliter labitur.

² Ep. 114, 1 hoc quod audire vulgo soles, quod apud Graecos in proverbium cessit: talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita.—115, 2 oratio cultus animi est, etc.—114, 22 quomodo in vino non ante lingua titubat quam mens cessit oneri et inclinata vel prodita est: ita ista orationis quid aliud quam ebrietas nulli molesta est, nisi animus labat. ideo ille curetur: ab illo sensus, ab illo verba exeunt, ab illo nobis est habitus, vultus, incessus. illo sano ac valente oratio quoque robusta, fortis, virilis est: si ille procubuit, et cetera ruinam sequuntur.

conformity to nature, may be expected to have faults of style. Seneca points out that such is the case.¹ And, with all his admiration for Fabianus, he did not try to conceal the weaknesses that might be detected in a close examination of the details of what he wrote (ep. 100, 5; 100, 11).

If peculiarities of style result from corresponding peculiarities of character, style becomes an index of character. The relation of the two is more frequently referred to by Seneca under this aspect. The style of Maecenas is that of a drunken man. His loose speech reminds us of his loose tunic and other idiosyncrasies. The faults of his style show that he was effeminate, not mild, and that his head was turned by too much good fortune.² An anxious and polished style points to a mind occupied with trivial things.³ Bedizenment in toilet or language betokens a lack of soundness and strength (ep. 115, 2). Faults, to be sure, are propagated in some instances, he admits, by mere imitation without being an index of the man himself.⁴

The influence of character on style is not confined, according to Seneca, to the individual. When the strict morals of the state break down and give way to pleasure, the speech of the time is marked by an imitation of public manners.⁵ Good fortune spreads luxury abroad. This shows itself first in the care of the body, in furniture, in the houses themselves, in the table, and at last, when the mind forms the habit of feeling disgust for what is customary and regards the usual as low, it also strives after what is new in speech, coming at length, as it wanders away from nature, to love faultiness itself (ep. 114, 8-11). Nor is the cor-

¹ Ep. 114, 12 *da mihi quemcumque vis, magni nominis virum: dicam, quid illi aetas sua ignoverit, quid in illo sciens dissimulaverit.*

² Ep. 114, 4 *videbis itaque eloquentiam ebrii hominis.*—114, 4 *non oratio eius aequae soluta est quam ipse discinctus?*—114, 6 *non statim, cum haec legeris, hoc tibi occurret, hunc esse, qui solutis tunicis in urbe semper incesserit?* etc.—114, 8 *apparet enim mollem fuisse, non mitem.*—114, 8 *hoc istae ambages compositionis, hoc verba transversa, hoc sensus miri, magni quidem saepe, sed enervati dum exeunt, cuius manifestum facient: motum illi felicitate nimia caput.*

³ Ep. 115, 2 *cuiuscumque orationem videris sollicitam et politam, scito animum quoque non minus esse pusillis occupatum.*

⁴ Ep. 114, 20 *haec ergo et eiusmodi vitia, quae alicui inpressit imitatio, non sunt indicia luxuriae nec animi corrupti.*

⁵ Ep. 114, 2 *quemadmodum autem uniuscuiusque actio dicendis similis est, sic genus dicendi aliquando imitatur publicos mores, si disciplina civitatis laboravit et se in delicias dedit.*

rupt influence of a time seen in the speech of the uneducated only. It affects all classes, the more highly cultured being distinguished from the rest by dress, not by judgment (ep. 114, 12). Looked at from the opposite point of view, pleasure in a corrupt form of language is a proof that manners have deteriorated. License of speech, provided it is frequent, indicates a decline of public morals.¹

If, now, the general principle that underlies Seneca's theory of style should be applied in any particular case, it would be necessary to take into account three things, the kind of subject-matter, the character of the writer, and the character of the persons addressed. A style that would be in accordance with nature in one set of circumstances would not be in another. Seneca observes this principle. Much of what he says about writing has to do with one particular branch of literature. It is plain that this consideration cannot be left out of sight, if we would judge fairly either Seneca's theory or the style of his own works.

It is not difficult to determine what the specific style is to which so many of Seneca's observations pertain. He compares his letters with public oral address and shows them to be a better means of imparting the principles of philosophy (ep. 38). He discusses at length, with passing reference to style, the manner of delivery of a philosopher (ep. 40). He justifies the style of his letters to Lucilius by reference, not to a model epistolary form in general, but to the right method of presenting the truths of philosophy (ep. 75). In defending the style of Fabianus, while he admits that Fabianus lacks oratorical force (ep. 100, 8), he reminds Lucilius that they are considering the style, not of an orator, but of a philosopher (ep. 100, 1). And he compares Fabianus with Cicero and Livy, and perhaps with Asinius Pollio, as writers of philosophy (ep. 100, 9). Seneca's theory, then, though some of its features pertain to all kinds of writing and though some of his statements, as we have already seen, are made in the most general way, yet has to do primarily with a popular philosophical style.

¹ Ep. 114, 11 itaque ubicumque videris orationem corruptam placere, ibi mores quoque a recto descivisse non erit dubium. quomodo conviviorum luxuria, quomodo vestium aegrae civitatis indicia sunt, sic orationis licentia, si modo frequens est, ostendit animos quoque, a quibus verba exeunt, prodisse.

The several qualities of style recognized by Seneca as appropriate to philosophical writing may all be considered as growing out of the fundamental requirement of conformity to nature. In the first place, it follows from the nature of language as a means and not an end, that it should be the aim of the writer in any department of literature whatever to exhibit his matter rather than his style, in other words, to make his style unobtrusive. When the matter is philosophy, this quality of style becomes, from the point of view of Seneca, all the more important. He has greater things for Lucilius to attend to than words and the putting of them together. He wishes him in writing to consider the what, not the how. He expresses admiration for Fabianus, because he gave his thought, not to so insignificant a thing as words, but to the importance of his subject; because he constructed character, not sentences; because he wrote for the heart and not for the ear; because he made everything contribute to progress toward virtue and did not seek applause; because, when he received applause, he gained it, not by the charm of his style, but by the greatness of his thought.¹ Philosophy, he maintains, does not have for its purpose to please the people. That is for other arts. The words of the philosopher should be spoken, not for the pleasure, but for the profit of the hearer. Philosophy, unlike other arts, which are concerned with the intellect only, has to do with the affairs of the heart, with character. If it were possible, Seneca would prefer to show rather than to say what he thinks, putting language entirely out of sight.² And this is not merely a matter of purpose on the part of the writer. The style as such should be self-effacing. Its charm, if it has any, should be such as to exhibit the matter rather than itself. Eloquence of expression harms, if it creates a desire for itself rather

¹ Ep. 115, 1 *nimis anxium esse te circa verba et compositionem, mi Lucili, nolo: habeo maiora, quae cures. quare quid scribas, non quemadmodum. —100, 10 vis illum adsidere pusillae rei, verbis: ille rerum se magnitudini addixit. —100, 2 mores ille, non verba composuit et animis scripsit ista, non auribus. —100, 11 ad profectum omnia tendunt, ad bonam mentem, non quaeritur plausus. —52, 11 disserebat populo Fabianus, sed audiebatur modeste. erumpebat interdum magnus clamor laudantium, sed quem rerum magnitudo evocaverat, non sonus inoffense ac molliter orationis elapsae.*

² Ep. 52, 13 *relinquantur istae voces illis artibus, quae propositum habent populo placere: philosophia adoretur. —75, 5 non delectent verba nostra, sed prosint. —75, 5 aliae artes ad ingenium totae pertinent, hic animi negotium agitur. —75, 2 si fieri posset, quid sentiam, ostendere quam loqui mallet.*

than for the thing communicated.¹ Lucilius is praised for keeping his words under control, for not being carried away by the language, for making everything concise and suited to the subject, for saying as much as he wishes and signifying more than he says, in short, for keeping language subordinate and letting it do its proper work of communicating thought and not attracting attention to itself.²

And yet Seneca does not teach that beauty is objectionable in the philosophical style. He approves of the eloquence, elegance, and brilliancy of the style of Fabianus (ep. 58, 6; 100, 5). He is careful to say that he does not wish philosophical discourse, dealing as it does with great themes, to be meagre and dry.³ He makes, however, in this connection a second requirement for the philosophical style: it should have the quality of being easy. If charm of expression can be attained without anxious attention to it, if it is ready at hand or costs but little, it should accompany a most glorious matter. In this very ease of speech there is a characteristic beauty. But a great deal of work should not be expended on the words. Fabianus, though not careless, did not trouble himself about his style; though eloquent, he did not aim to be so but drew his eloquence after him like a shadow.⁴ This ease should also appear in the language itself. The style of the philosopher should not be anxious. Of this, too, Fabianus furnishes an exemplification. He not only wrote easily but he put his thought in a form that pictured this ease. His language is fluent and shows plainly that he did not work at it a long time. The words are well chosen but have not been hunted up with effort. And with reference to himself Seneca, in reply to the criticism that his letters are not written with sufficient care, ridicules an anxious style and declares that

¹ Ep. 75, 5 *sit talis, ut res potius quam se ostendat.*—52, 14 *nocet illis eloquentia, si non rerum cupiditatem facit, sed sui.*

² Ep. 59, 4 *habes verba in potestate. non effert te oratio nec longius quam destinasti trahit.*—59, 5 *pressa sunt omnia et rei aptata. loqueris quantum vis et plus significas quam loqueris.*

³ Ep. 75, 3 *non mehercules ieiuna esse et arida volo, quae de rebus tam magnis dicentur. neque enim philosophia ingenio renuntiat.*

⁴ Ep. 75, 5 *si tamen contingere eloquentia non sollicito potest, si aut parata est aut parvo constat, adsit et res pulcherrimas prosequatur.*—100, 1 *est decor proprius orationis leniter lapsae.*—75, 3 *multum tamen operae impendi verbis non oportet.*—100, 5 *Fabianus non erat neglegens in oratione sed securus.*—100, 10 *eloquentiam velut umbram non hoc agens trahit.*

he wishes his letters to be unlabored and easy like familiar conversation. Pains-taking polish he does not regard as a manly ornament.¹ This quality of ease follows from conformity to nature. It is the processes governed by right reason that go on without effort.

Reason looked at as virtue demands that the style of the philosopher be sincere. To this quality Seneca gives especial emphasis. It is disgraceful, in his view, for the philosopher to say one thing and think another, and still more disgraceful to write one thing and think another. There should be harmony between thought and word, life and speech. And it is the thought, the character that should receive the greater attention.² The spirit of the man should appear also in his language. The sincerity of his life, as in the case of Fabianus, should be stamped upon his style. This is a quality that Seneca also professes to have aimed at in his own writings.³

Out of sincerity springs another quality of style akin to it. The man who means what he says does not try to cover up his thought but to make it clear. In so doing he conforms to the nature of language, the purpose of which is to reveal thought, not to conceal it. In cautioning Lucilius not to give too much attention to the subtleties in which the Stoics had been prone to indulge, Seneca says, in a general way, it is the things which are clear that become virtue.⁴ And more specifically, with reference to manner of expression, he points out as one of the

¹ Ep. 100, 4 *oratio sollicita philosophum non decet*.—100, 2 *illud plane fatetur et praefert, non esse tractatam nec diu tortam*.—100, 5 *electa verba sunt, non captata*.—75, 1 *minus tibi accuratas a me epistulas mitti quereris, quis enim accurate loquitur, nisi qui vult putide loqui? qualis sermo meus esset, si una sederemus aut ambularemus, inlaboratus et facilis, tales esse epistulas meas volo*.—115, 2 *oratio cultus animi est: si circumtonsa est et fucata et manu facta, ostendit illum quoque non esse sincerum et habere aliquid fracti. non est ornamentum virile concinnitas*.

² Ep. 24, 19 *turpe est aliud loqui, aliud sentire: quanto turpius aliud scribere, aliud sentire!*—75, 4 *haec sit propositi nostri summa: quod sentimus loquamur, quod loquimur sentiamus: concordet sermo cum vita*.—115, 1 *quaere quid scribas, non quemadmodum. et hoc ipsum non ut scribas, sed ut sentias, ut illa quae senseris magis adplices tibi et velut signes*.

³ Ep. 100, 11 *denique illud praestabit, ut liqueat tibi illum sensisse quae scripsit. intelleges hoc actum, ut tu scires quid illi placeret, non ut ille placeret tibi*.—75, 3 *hoc unum plane tibi adprobare vellem, omnia me illa sentire quae dicerem nec tantum sentire sed amare*.

⁴ Ep. 48, 12 *aperta decent et simplicia bonitatem*.

faults in the unnatural style of Maecenas, that he avoided being understood, and censures the obscure brevity that was the fashion in the time of Sallust. On the other hand, he regards it as one of the merits of Fabianus that there was much light in all he wrote and that his language though fluent was free from confusion. He approves also of figurative language, when not employed to excess, because it takes the speaker and hearer into the very presence of the object.¹

A prime condition of clearness is another quality distinct from clearness but closely related to it. Seneca himself links the two in a sentence already quoted in part. Things that are clear, he says, and things that are simple become virtue (ep. 48, 12). This is a matter of both thought and language. Referring to the crafty shrewdness and the knotty questions of Stoic dialectics, he demands of the philosopher simplicity of reasoning (ep. 49, 12; 82, 19). As regards language, we find him censuring the involved style of Maecenas, declaring that the style which has to do with truth ought to be simple, likening the style of Fabianus, which he approves, to a plain house of simple beauty as contrasted with one abounding in luxury, objecting to an extreme use of figures of speech, but not to the use of them as employed in the simple style of the ancients, assuring Lucilius that in speaking orally he would be content to present his thoughts plainly without embellishing or weakening them.² From the point of view of simplicity may also be explained Seneca's fondness for short sentences in preference to long periods, which he disliked.³ According to

¹ Ep. 114, 4 magni vir ingenii fuerat, si illud egisset via rectiore, si non vitasset intellegi.—114, 17 sic Sallustio vigente anputatae sententiae et verba ante expectatum cadentia et obscura brevitae fuere pro cultu.—100, 11 sed multum erit in omnibus lucis.—100, 2 adeo larga est et sine perturbatione.—59, 6 parabolis referti sunt, quas existimo necessarias, non ex eadem causa qua poetis, sed ut inbecillitatis nostrae adminicula sint, ut et dicentem et audientem in rem praesentem adducant.

² Ep. 114, 4 videbis itaque eloquentiam ebrii hominis involutam.—40, 4 adice nunc, quod quae veritati operam dat oratio incompta esse debet et simplex.—100, 6 desit sane varietas marmorum et concisura aquarum cubiculis interfluentium et pauperis cella et quicquid aliud luxuria non contenta decore simplici miscet: quod dici solet, domus recta est.—59, 6 illi qui simpliciter et demonstrandae rei causa eloquebantur parabolis referti sunt.—75, 2 ista oratoribus reliquissem, contentus sensus meos ad te pertulisse, quos nec exornassem nec abiecissem.

³ Ep. 114, 16 quid de illa loquar, in qua verba differuntur et diu expectata vix ad clausulas redeunt?

these examples, the simple style becoming a philosopher has two phases: it is not involved or complicated, whether in arrangement of words or in complexity of parts; and, while it may have ornament, it must not have excess of ornament.

Two other qualities of the philosophical style are touched upon by Seneca. The first is prescribed by the nature of language, the purposes of which are best realized when it is pure. Seneca speaks of his own age as having departed from purity of speech.¹ He justifies the use of a word by referring to Cicero and Fabianus as authorities (ep. 58, 6). And he praises the carefully chosen words of Fabianus (ep. 100, 5). The other quality is one especially appropriate to the matter to be communicated by the philosopher as conceived by Seneca. It is nobility of style. He thought that the style of Fabianus had this quality. There was nothing low in it. His thoughts were noble and grand, and his manner, though not free from defects, was on the whole noble.²

Such were the qualities that Seneca deemed appropriate to the philosophical style. He no doubt thought that they could be combined in different literary forms for the uses of philosophy; and yet he apparently came to regard one of these forms as especially advantageous for promulgating that kind of philosophy which he considered the most important. As we have already seen, his remarks on style are found almost exclusively in his letters and in some cases have direct reference to them. He also expressly points out the superiority of this more quiet form ("*summissiora verba*") to the philosophical lecture (ep. 38). So far, indeed, as particular qualities of style are concerned, the letter must be regarded as in the highest degree favorable for attaining ease, sincerity, and simplicity.

We find, then, underlying the statements made by Seneca concerning manner of expression the fundamental principle that style should conform to nature. It appears further that the attainment of this ideal is hindered more or less and in different ways by defects and peculiarities of character; that a philosophical style should be distinguished from other types; that the desirable qualities of such a style are unobtrusiveness, ease, sincerity, clearness, simplicity, purity, and nobility; and that a form highly adapted for this combination of qualities is the literary epistle.

¹ Ep. 39, 1 olim, cum latine loqueremur, summarium vocabatur.

² Ep. 100, 5 nihil invenies sordidum.—100, 5 sensus honestos et magnificos habes.—100, 8 sed totum corpus, videris quam sit comptum, honestum est.

Thus far we have been dealing with Seneca's ideas as such without any effort to determine which were borrowed and which, if any, were his own. Looking at this phase of his theory one can see at a glance that many of its details were already common-places of rhetoric, while in the case of other features the question of originality is not so easily settled. Seneca's idea of the natural in writing, that is, conformity to nature in the broad Stoic sense, should not be confounded with the more narrow and more common meaning of the word natural. It is in the latter sense that Aristotle says the orator should have the appearance of using language, not artificially, but naturally (*rhet.* 3, 2, 4). Confusion as to what was natural had begun already in the time of Quintilian. Some thought that only the style resembling ordinary conversation was natural and that the style of the most ancient writers followed nature most closely. Quintilian himself, with nearer approach to the view of Seneca, declares that conversation and oratory differ in nature and that the more effective a man's speech is, the more it accords with the nature of eloquence (12, 10, 40-44), in other words, that it is natural in proportion as it is effective. Seneca's idea is simply a special application of the Stoic principle.

The relation between character and style was in general, as indicated by the Greek proverb, already familiar. But, as has been pointed out by Norden (*I. S.* 306), it received from Seneca a more energetic treatment than from any one else in antiquity. This was due to the close connection between individual character and the adapting of style to nature.

It was only carrying out one of the earliest teachings of rhetoric, namely, that the language should be appropriate to the subject-matter (*Arist. rhet.* 3, 2, 1; 3, 12, 1), to require a distinctive style for philosophy. Cicero, indeed, had done this (*orator* 19, 62-63). He had characterized the styles of the Greek and Roman writers on philosophy (*de orat.* 3, 18, 66; *de fin.* 1, 5, 14-15; 3, 1, 3; *Tusc. disp.* 2, 3, 7-8) and had given his own idea of what the philosophical style should be (*orator* 19, 64; *Tusc. disp.* 1, 4, 7).

Among the special qualities of style clearness and purity were regular requirements. Cicero, in his discussion of the philosophical manner of presentation, takes it for granted that attention is to be directed to the matter rather than to the words (*orator* 16, 51). At the same time, to illustrate the importance of the

how as well as of the what in philosophy, he quotes the remark of Carneades, that Clitomachus taught the same things but Charmadas not only taught the same things but taught them in the same way. Seneca's father had spoken of the style of Arellius Fuscus as too labored and polished for a person preparing himself to teach philosophy, and had also objected to it on the ground that it was too intricate, that is, lacked the simplicity which a philosophical style should have (II praef. 1).

The philosophical letter had been so often used before that it is not easy to ascertain what led to its approval and adoption by Seneca. The most plausible explanation is suggested by Seneca's earliest letters, in which he so frequently quotes Epicurus. When Seneca was writing these letters he seems to have been reading the letters of Epicurus (cf. ep. 9, 8; 14, 17), letters famous in antiquity for their simplicity and clearness (cf. Cic. de fin. 1, 5, 14-16; Laert. Diog. 10, 13), which qualities we find Seneca emphasizing as appropriate to the language of philosophy.

In so far as the details of Seneca's theory are concerned, we have discovered little that was absolutely new. Certain ideas, however, received from his hand a decidedly new emphasis and new prominence, especially the relation of style to character, the recognition of a philosophical style, and the qualities of unobtrusiveness, ease, and sincerity. His combination of qualities for a philosophical style is, also, not found elsewhere. The connection of his views with the fundamental principle of his philosophy and the special emphasis upon the relation between style and character give an ethical tone to the whole discussion.

In this last feature we see in part the purpose that led him to express himself on the subject. It came within the scope of moral philosophy. It had to do with an important element of life, which in all its activities the Stoics sought to bring under the regulations of their system. His purpose had at the same time a practical side. He professes to answer criticisms of Lucilius upon the style of his letters (ep. 75, 1). It is probable that he had others also in mind besides Lucilius. In view of the conflicting literary tendencies of the time,¹ we may conjecture that criticism of his style, so frequent later, had begun already in his own life-time, notwithstanding the widespread popularity (cf. Quint. 10, 1, 126) of his writings.

¹ Cf. ep. 114, 13 sqq. and Norden, l. c., I, S. 257.

Having set forth Seneca's theory in full, we may now examine the contradictions and weaknesses by which it is supposed to be disfigured. First of all, it has been said that the mention of *abruptae sententiae et suspiciosae* as a fault (ep. 114, 1) does not harmonize with the praise of Lucilius for a conciseness of expression in which he signifies more than he says (ep. 59, 5). When we examine the first of these passages, we find that the fault referred to consists in a brevity that is carried to the point of obscurity. In the same letter farther on Seneca designates this particular fault as *obscura brevis* (ep. 114, 17). But he does not speak of the style of Lucilius as leaving something to be suspected nor indicate in any other way that Lucilius fails to make his meaning perfectly clear. The supposed inconsistency, accordingly, does not exist. Between condemnation of obscure brevity and commendation of pregnant brevity there is no conflict.

A still further contradiction has been assumed between the censure of sentences the meaning of which is obscured by excessive brevity and approval of the pointed expressions that are technically called *sententiae*. It is not of the latter but of thoughts that Seneca is speaking in the passage in which he says that faults are not confined to the *genus sententiarum* (ep. 114, 16). His sanction of the *sententiae* in the technical sense, in theory as well as in practice, is unmistakable and uniform. While he admits that they are lacking in the writings of Fabianus, the excellence of whose style shows itself in other ways (ep. 100, 5; 100, 8), he refers with pride to the frequent use of such expressions by the Stoics in general (ep. 33, 2-3; 33, 6). But fondness for the epigrammatic sentence is not inconsistent with disapproval of obscure, short sentences, whether they be plain or pointed. A sentence may be brief and epigrammatic and signify more than is actually expressed in words and yet not have the fault of obscure brevity.

Seneca's emphatic disapproval of the impetuously rapid delivery of Serapio (ep. 40) is supposed to be in conflict with what he says about Fabianus (ep. 100, 1-3). Let us examine the two statements. In the one case Seneca is speaking solely of the delivery of Serapio, whom Lucilius had recently heard. This was so rapid that the word *effundere* did not seem strong enough to picture the torrent of speech, which is described by the words *premere* and *urgere*. In the other case Seneca discusses, not

the delivery, but the style of Fabianus, whose works Lucilius had been reading. The fluency of the style Seneca admits but describes it by the simple *fundere*. Then, granting for the sake of argument the correctness of the criticism of Lucilius, he adds that, if Fabianus had been heard instead of read, his style as a whole would have won the approval of Lucilius, although, had there been time to examine the parts, defects would have been found in them, but, that after all, the man who wins our approval is greater than the one who merits it. Whether the delivery of Fabianus was rapid or slow is not indicated. It is obvious that what Seneca praises in Fabianus is not what he censures in Serapio.

The statements that the philosophical style should be simple (ep. 40, 4) and that it should not be meagre and dry (ep. 75, 3) have been declared to be contradictory. What Seneca means by a simple style has apparently not been seen. For, if with him we understand it to be a style not involved nor overloaded with ornament, we have no reason for assuming that simplicity and charm of speech exclude each other.

Seneca has been criticised for presenting together Cicero, Pollio, and Livy in comparison with Fabianus (ep. 100, 9). But, as we have seen above, he compares Cicero and Livy, and probably Pollio, with Fabianus as writers of philosophy, assigning to each a rank, just as we are accustomed to compare Shakespeare and Milton in a general way with all subsequent English poets.

The alleged contradiction between *composita* (ep. 40, 2) and *incomposita* (ep. 40, 4) disappears when the text is properly constituted by writing with Schultess in the second passage *incompta*.

In regard to the style of Seneca himself only one question is pertinent to our present inquiry: Are there such discrepancies between his practice and his theory as to indicate insincerity in the presentation of the latter? It must be borne in mind that he did not claim to have attained absolute wisdom, to follow nature perfectly (ep. 6, 1; 42, 1). If he was ready to point out some fault in the style of every great writer (ep. 114, 12), he did not think his own free from fault. In fact, he makes no exception of himself in speaking of the diminished purity of speech in his times (ep. 39, 1) and he explicitly acknowledges his occasional shortcomings in respect to propriety in the use of words (nat. quaest. 3, 18, 7). So far as the other qualities are concerned, he

leaves us to judge for ourselves. On certain points there can hardly be a difference of opinion. His style shows plainly enough that he wrote with ease. While he is not always free from obscurity, he is for the most part clear. While his tone is at times too familiar, perhaps, to be called noble, it is not low. Keeping in mind, as we are bound to do, that as conceived by Seneca a simple style is a style not involved nor overloaded with ornament, we must admit that in general his style is simple. Two qualities remain, unobtrusiveness and sincerity. If, as is customary, we proceed in the unjust fashion of Quintilian and, judging Seneca by the usage of an age quite different from his own, measure his style by the standard of Ciceronian prose, we shall not find it unobtrusive, but attracting our attention at every step. If, on the other hand, in reading the works of this man so conspicuously in harmony with the taste of his time (cf. Tac. ann. 13, 3), we could take the point of view of intelligent and unprejudiced contemporaries, we should receive a far different impression. If, finally, we give due weight to the consideration that he composed without effort and that the epigrammatic form was the natural utterance of his acute and unique mind, we shall not be unable to reconcile with his manner of expression the statement that there is one thing of which he wishes to convince Lucilius above all others, namely, that he means what he says (ep. 75, 3). He fell short, to some extent, of his ideal. But a failure to realize fully in practice what he aimed at proves no insincerity in the aim.

It appears, accordingly, that the statements of Seneca on the subject of style, though not put forth in systematic form, can nevertheless be reduced to a system; that they are not, when properly interpreted, inconsistent with each other; that they are not at variance with Seneca's own practice to such an extent as to betray insincerity; that they are not marked by a lack of settled judgment; and that in some aspects they contain an element of originality.

FRANK IVAN MERCHANT.

V.—THE MOODS OF INDIRECT QUOTATION.¹

I. *The Indicative.*

It is natural for the average adult to make a distinction among ideas, between those which are the product of his own observation and thinking, and those which are communicated to him ready-made by other persons. Ideas of the former class are, as a matter of course, allowed to enter the mind without reserve and are accepted as true, while those of the latter class find the mind on its guard, as it were, and are only admitted on equal terms with the former after a more or less careful scrutiny, if indeed they are accepted at all. To be sure, there are exceptions to this rule in particular cases and under special circumstances. A careful and conscientious man will be on the alert against the shortcomings of his own mental and sensual processes, on the one hand, and long or intimate association with another person and uniform veracity on his part will, on the other hand, lead one to grant his ideas the same unquestioning admission as one's own. But if we take into account only the average mind in its ordinary workings, those conditions, namely, which mould linguistic practice, we are obliged to look upon the distinction between the two classes of ideas as a fundamental one. The proof that this view is correct is furnished by the wide extent to which the distinction is recognized in the forms of speech.

From a psychological point of view we can readily see that the two classes of ideas must affect the mind in different ways. For entirely apart from intentional or unintentional falsehoods in the statements of other persons, their ideas must necessarily, in a degree, take us unawares, and appear strange to us, since

¹ The writer is conscious of the fact that the title and headings of this paper are somewhat misleading. Its main object is to assign the Latin subjunctive of indirect quotation to its proper place as a mood, and what is said about the indicative and the accusative and infinitive is intended only as a setting for the treatment of the subjunctive, and as an aid in accomplishing this main object. This will explain the sketchiness of the treatment in the first two divisions of the article, which are not so much coordinate with the third, as preparatory to it.

A preliminary paper which briefly discussed some of the points treated in this article was published in the *School Review* for May, 1902.

they are the result of a preceding mental experience with which we are, perhaps wholly, unacquainted. Besides, the fact that these various ideas come to us each with a stamp of its own, affected as it is, though ever so slightly, by the permanent or temporary peculiarities of its author, contrasts strongly with the uniformity, as it appears to us, of our own mental and sensual activities. And this lack of harmony in foreign ideas, with each other and with our own, even though the evidence of downright falsehood be lacking, will naturally tend to prevent our minds from feeling the same degree of ease and hospitality toward them which we feel toward ideas of our own production.

Natural as all this appears, however, it is nevertheless evident that this distinction between foreign and native ideas as such, has not existed at all times in the history of language. For in addition to those forms of indirect quotation by which this distinction is clearly and consistently made, there are others in which it is not found as an inherent element, but only as an external addition, a sort of afterthought. We find, namely, that not only the subjunctive, optative and infinitive are used in clauses of quotation, but that the indicative is used also. And in the case of the indicative it is not the mood, but the added verb of saying, which indicates in any way that the speaker is not expressing his own thought but that of someone else. If we strip the mood of its accessories, take it back, in other words, to the time when it stood in an independent clause, we have a form of expression for the foreign idea, which does not differ in the least from that which would be used for a native idea. At that stage, if A said "I saw a bear", B would later express the idea he gets by saying "A saw a bear", exactly as if he had obtained the idea by the use of his own faculties, instead of obtaining it from the statement of A. There must have been a time, therefore, in the mental history of the race, as there is a time in the mental life of a child, when the distinction between *meum* and *tuum* in the matter of ideas was not yet clearly made, and when it was not found necessary to distinguish between them in speech.

Of course, in any highly developed language we shall not look for this method of quotation in its baldest form outside of the nursery. For the confusion which it would cause between one's own ideas, which we feel to be true, and those of another person, whose veracity may perhaps be very doubtful to one, would be intolerable to the mental habits of a civilized adult. But language

is conservative, and though a form has become useless in itself, it may still be patched and propped in such a way as to make it do service under different and more exacting conditions. "A saw a bear" would, for example, easily be designated unmistakably as the statement of A, by the addition of a paratactic verb like "he told me" or "he said", and could thus be clearly distinguished from all ideas belonging to B himself. And in this new form the original indicative of indirect statement is, in fact, found widely used, even in highly developed languages, especially in their colloquial forms. In English, indeed, the disappearance of the subjunctive has once more brought this form of quotation to high honor. We find it also used freely in German. In Latin and Greek, on the other hand, the paratactic form as a method of quotation, that is, with the verb of saying or thinking in the second or third person, or in the past tense, appears to be found only in the slightest traces.¹ Still, in oral conversation it may have been used quite extensively even in these languages.²

This particular form of indirect quotation is clearly, as we have stated, an adaptation of a primitive independent indicative clause to more complex conditions. In its new form it fully satisfies the demands of careful thinking, since the source or ownership of the idea is definitely indicated. Necessary as the addition of this paratactic verb of saying was, however, the development of the construction along this line seems to have been arrested in both Latin and Greek. For we find not only a great scarcity of paratactic forms, but even the hypotactic forms appear, in both languages, at a later date than was the case in other constructions. In Homer, for instance, the hypotactic form of indirect quotation with the finite verb in the quoted part, is still in its first beginnings,³ and in Latin it did not apparently find

¹ See, for example, Becker, *Beiordnende u. unterordnende Satzverbindung*, pp. 9-20. So Plin. *Epp.* VII, 27, 13, *venerunt per fenestras (ita narrat) in tunicis albis duo cubantemque detonderunt.*

² Cases where the added verb of saying or thinking is introduced by a relative *ut* or *ὥς* are of course common enough.

³ According to Schmitt, *Über d. Urspr. d. Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griech.* (p. 70) there are only 15 cases of the clause with *ὅτι*, *ὥς*, etc. used in indirect quotation in Homer (3 in the *Iliad*, 12 in the *Odyssey*). All of these have the indicative, moreover, after past as well as present verbs. The close connection of the constructions with the independent indicative of quotation is also shown by the fact that their tenses are all still adjusted to the reporter's point of view (Goodwin, *M. and T.* 671 and 674). A. J. P. XIV 373-6.

recognition in written speech, so far as the main clause of the quotation is concerned, before the time of the decline.¹ But this backwardness of the hypotactic form of indirect discourse in Latin and Greek was not due to the adequacy or convenience of the independent or paratactic forms of which we spoke above, but rather to the fact that these languages had in the meantime developed another and entirely different method of indirectly quoting foreign words or ideas, namely the accusative and infinitive.

II. *The Accusative and Infinitive.*

This construction shows a more vigorous growth and greater adaptability in Latin and Greek than it has in the Germanic languages. The two groups of languages are especially distinguished from each other by the wide use which is made of the construction in Latin and Greek with verbs of saying and thinking. Not only that, but it also seems, in the latter languages, to have reached a certain perfection in this wider field at a very early date. We find, for example, that in Homer there are some 130 cases of it after *φημί* alone, as against only 15 cases of the clause with *ὥς*, *ὅτι* and similar conjunctions, after all expressions of saying.²

The form in which the accusative and infinitive is found in the earlier authors, in both Latin and Greek, is a very simple one. Its development from the accusative of the direct object is here still quite evident, for there is, as a rule, nothing besides the bare accusative with its added infinitive. Subordinate clauses are rather uncommon. Compact as this early form of the construction is and hardly more cumbersome than the direct object itself, while at the same time performing its function of quotation admirably, it is easy to see how it could, in the general movement from parataxis to hypotaxis, not only hold its own, but seriously threaten the full development and very existence of the more cumbersome paratactic form of quotation which we have just mentioned. In Latin, as we saw, it did, in fact, prevent this development throughout the whole classical period.

Now when we find, in Homer and Plautus, that the overwhelmingly prevalent form of the accusative and infinitive was

¹ For an extensive collection of examples, see Mayen, *De particulis Quod, Quia, Quoniam, Quomodo, Ut pro acc. cum inf. post verba sent. et decl. positis*, Diss. Kiel, '89.

² Schmitt, l. c. [It is noteworthy that *φημί* rejects *ὅτι* and *ὥς* during the classic period. Also A. J. P. IV 56; XIV 374, XVI 395, XVII 517.—B. L. G.]

a very simple one, we will of course not assume that this simplicity necessarily reflects a like quality in the utterance of the original speaker. Neither does the brevity of the accusative and infinitive prove the brevity of the original expression which it reproduces. The fact is rather that it matters little whether the original speech be short and simple, or long and complex. For the hearer's mind will naturally retain and reproduce only that part of it which happens to interest him at the time. And if, in addition to all this, the period under consideration is one in which hypotaxis has not yet come to be the common mode of expression, the form of the quotation will of course naturally be simple.¹

But in the course of development, this primitive and subjective method of quoting only that part which interests the reporter, will give way to a more objective method which does fuller justice to the expression of the original speaker. To the single clause of the primitive quotation, others will now be added, such as give the time, cause or some other circumstance which had been a part of the original speech. And with the necessity of making these additions will come a crisis in the history of such a construction as the accusative and infinitive of early Greek and Latin. For its future will necessarily depend upon its ability to adapt itself to the altered conditions.

We can still clearly distinguish two lines along which an extension of the simple accusative and infinitive took place in the paratactic stage. The evidence for one of these is furnished by the cases, rather numerous in Greek, though less so in Latin, where we have the accusative and infinitive in the subordinate as well as the main clauses of the quotation.² This can only mean that the original single accusative and infinitive had grown by the paratactic addition of other clauses of the same form, which expressed the subordinate ideas referred to. Such a

¹ It is easy, however, to lay too much stress upon the stage of development as determining absolutely the simplicity or complexity of a construction. For linguistic forms are not only the product of thought, but themselves also, in turn, determine the form of the thought. When a construction, whether simple or complex, has once intrenched itself in common usage, it will not readily be ousted from its position, even though a rival construction should be ready to take its place. Such a change would mean not only a change of expression, but countless readjustments of the speaker's habits of thought, as well.

² For examples cf. Kühner, *Lat. Gram.* II, 1036 ff. The infinitive is especially common in relative clauses.

method of extending the construction seems for that stage a perfectly natural one. It was not destined to play an important part, however, in the fully developed language, and its doom was sealed, so far as a full development was concerned, just as soon as the subordinate clause became the common construction for the addition of subsidiary ideas. For the connectives which introduced these subordinate clauses were practically everywhere else in Latin and Greek associated with clauses containing finite forms of the verb.

The second way in which the simple accusative and infinitive was extended so as to include subsidiary clauses, did not suffer in its growth from this obstacle. It illustrates, however, no less beautifully the capacity of a language to make the most of existing materials, in the process of adapting itself to changed conditions and requirements. While in the former case the simple accusative and infinitive grew by additions in which its own form was reproduced, it accomplished its extension in the latter by pressing into service its old rival, the independent indicative clause of quotation. Examples of this composite formation, though very rare, may still be found, as for instance in Il. XV, 178-183:

εἰ δέ οἱ οὐ ἐπέεσσ' ἐπιπείσεις, ἀλλ' ἀλογήσεις,
ἡπείλει καὶ κείνος ἐναντίβιον πολεμίζων
ἐνθάδ' ἐλεύσεσθαι· σὲ δ' ὑπεξάλεσθαι ἀνῶγει
χεῖρας, ἐπεὶ σέο φησὶ βίη πολὺν φέρτερος εἶναι
καὶ γενεῇ πρότερος· σὸν δ' οὐκ ὁδεταί φίλον ἦτορ
ἴσόν οἱ φάσθαι, τὸν τε στυγέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι.

This is the quotation by Iris of the speech of Jove in lines 162-7 of the same book. There are three verbs of saying, ἡπείλει, ἀνῶγει and φησί, each used to quote a separate statement or command, and finally there are two clauses added coordinately, which have no verbs of saying and which are expressed in the words of the original speech, with the necessary changes of person. The last lines of the original speech of Jove (lines 166-7) are:

τοῦ δ' οὐκ ὁδεταί φίλον ἦτορ
ἴσον ἐμοὶ φάσθαι, τὸν τε στυγέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι.

An example in Latin is found in Plautus, *Persa* 303-5:

Iubeto habere animum bonum: dic me illam amare multum.
Ubi se adiuvat, ibi me adiuvat. quae dixi ut nuntiaries,
Satin ea tenes?

Another is in *Poenulus* 656 ff.:

Ait se peregrinum esse, huius ignarum oppidi:
Locum sibi velle liberum praeberier,
Ubi nequam faciat.

This is continued in line 662:

At enim hic clam furtim esse volt, nequis sciat
Neve arbiter sit. Nam hic latro in Sparta fuit,
Utquidem ipse nobeis dixit, apud regem Attalum:
Inde nunc aufugit, quoniam capitur oppidum.

In the last example, it will be noticed that the regular accusative and infinitive of quotation is continued first by an indicative with a parenthetical verb of saying (*utquidem*—), and then by another indicative without this addition (*Inde nunc aufugit*, etc.).

The corresponding form of quotation in English is seen in the following two passages from Howell's *Italian Journeys*:

"As to the Cimbri, he knew that they had their own language, which was yet harder than the German. The German was hard enough, but the Cimbrian! *Capo!*" (p. 236-7).

"Concerning his people he knew little; but the *Capo-gente* of *Fozza* could tell me everything" (p. 240).

With the spread of hypotactic forms in the language, these paratactic indicative clauses containing subordinate ideas, would naturally and inevitably fall into line as the subordinate clauses of the quotation, depending upon the main clause (in Greek and Latin upon the accusative and infinitive), which expresses the main idea of the quotation.

III. *The Subjunctive.*

There still remains a problem which contains the greatest difficulty of all, namely that presented by the use, in indirect quotation, of the optative in Greek, and of the subjunctive in Latin and German. If we consider this problem as one within the individual language, the difficulties of solution appear, indeed, to be insurmountable. And while a comparative treatment may not enable us to clear up the mystery at all points, it will still be found to possess a suggestiveness that will help us to see the whole matter from a new point of view, which will make it more tangible, if not more simple.

If we look at our subject without preconceived notions, it does not appear, to start with, that there is any better reason for separating the Greek optative and the Latin subjunctive of in-

direct discourse from each other or from the corresponding subjunctive of indirect discourse in the Germanic languages, than there would be for separating the Greek optative of wish, for instance, from the Latin or German subjunctive of wish. There can be little question that the function of these moods of indirect quotation in the three languages is a common one, and the difference, so far as it is functional, between these moods and the indicative, also appears to be, broadly speaking, the same. It seems clear also from a comparison of the three languages, that the prevalence of the subjunctive or optative as the mood of indirect quotation is in each of them subject to great fluctuations at different periods. In early Latin, for instance, the field of the subjunctive is relatively smaller than it becomes later on, and in Homeric Greek we have a stage of that language, in which the optative is not yet employed for indirect statements at all.¹ And just as the use of these moods increases in one period, so it decreases again in another. In late Greek² as well as late Latin³ the tendency was decidedly in the latter direction, and a similar movement may easily be detected also in a comparison of present-day German with that of a hundred years ago. Moreover, these special moods of quotation have in common a strong tendency to confusion in the sequence of tenses, and especially a leaning toward a primary, when the sequence would require a secondary tense.⁴ A still further peculiarity which is displayed prominently in German and Greek, and to a considerable extent in early and late Latin also, is the greater frequency of the special mood of quotation after past verbs of saying.⁵

¹Cf. Schmitt, l. c.

²Cf. Burton, *New Testament Moods and Tenses*, § 344; also Jannaris, *Histor. Greek Grammar*, p. 474. With the statements made by J. about the use of the optative in Polybius (*App. V*, 8) compare, however, *Polyb. I*, 39, 11 and *II*, 68, 2.

³Cf. Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.*, p. 475².

⁴Almost any long passage of indirect discourse in a Latin historian will illustrate this point. For German, cf. Behaghel, *Gebrauch d. Zeitformen im Konjunktivischen Nebensatz im Deutschen*, p. 65. And in Greek, where the sequence involves the moods, while the indicative after past verbs of saying is a common construction, the optative after present verbs is found only in isolation.

⁵On the comparative frequency of the moods after past and present verbs in early Latin, see the collections of examples in Holtze, *Syntaxis prisc. script. Lat. II* p. 133 ff. and 191 ff. For illustrations from a late Latin author, see Reiter, *De Ammiani Marcellini usu orat. obl.* p. 47 and 49.

The chief difficulty in the way of an explanation of the subjunctive and optative of indirect quotation, has no doubt been the absence of an independent use of these moods which might be considered the original ancestor of their existing use in hypotaxis. Yet while this absence of an independent form may give us trouble when we try to understand the subordinate form, it is not hard to explain. For the conditions which would lead to the disappearance of an original independent subjunctive or optative of quotation, are precisely the same which did lead, as we saw, to the disappearance of the independent indicative, namely, the necessity of making certain distinctions which a fairly advanced state of mental development can not do without. That there was once an independent subjunctive of quotation, we may reasonably infer from the presence of the paratactic form which is still freely used in German.¹ Something corresponding closely to the paratactic subjunctive of indirect quotation, may be seen also in Latin,² for example in Terence, *Phormio* 970-3:

Ain tu, ubi quae lubitum fuerit peregre feceris
Neque huius sis veritus feminae primariae,
Quin novo modo ei faceres contumeliam,
Venias nunc precibus lautum peccatum tuom?

But entirely apart from its inherent difficulty, the problem has been badly confused by an apparently natural, but nevertheless false conception of the evolution of the hypotactic form of quotation. This view, implied more than expressed, is found, for instance, in Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.* § 208³, "Denn die Entwicklung des Satzbaus hat offenbar den Gang mitgemacht, den uns folgende Reihen veranschaulichen: (we pass over the illustrations of other clauses than those of indirect quotation) 1. Er sagte den Soldaten: gehet weg; 2. Er sagte den Soldaten, sie sollten weggehen; 3. Er sagte den Soldaten, dass sie weggehen sollten". Compare also § 235, 5, "Die sog. oratio obliqua besteht darin, dass die Rede eines andern einem einführenden V. dicendi unter-

¹ In dialect German it is even possible to find traces of an independent subjunctive clause of quotation, as we shall see later.

² Professor Gildersleeve is kind enough to remind me of the parenthetic clauses in Greek indirect discourse, which often have the optative, though they are introduced by γάρ or οὖν and are, therefore, independent in form. They differ slightly from strict cases of parataxis in that a subordinate clause of indirect quotation intervenes between them and the verb of saying. For example, *Xen. An.* 7, 3, 13 λέγον . . . ὅτι πάντες ἄξια λέγοι Σείθης· χειμὼν γὰρ εἴη.

geordnet wird. Dabei treten die Behauptungssätze in den Acc. c. inf., Aufforderung und Wunsch erscheint mittels Personen- und meistens auch Tempusverschiebung im Konjunktiv, etc."

If this means, as it evidently does, that the hypotactic form of indirect quotation is to be explained as growing out of the direct quotation as its original independent form, it is certainly wrong. For direct quotation, in the real sense of the term, can not develop or change at all, for the reason that it consists merely in the repetition of the words once spoken by another. The form in which these words are cast in the direct quotation is, therefore, fixed by the original speaker, and the moment that the reporter reproduces them from his own point of view, with change of person, tense, etc., it is no longer the same form of discourse, but an entirely different one.¹ The two methods of quotation, in other words, are not developed one from the other, but are from the very start two absolutely distinct ways of treating the same thought-matter. Direct quotation is the repetition of the *form* in which the original speaker expressed certain ideas, while indirect quotation is the expression by the hearer of these *ideas* as they lie in his own mind. Whether, in the latter case, the same individual words are used as in the original speech is a matter of small consequence. Even in direct quotation, the words of the original speaker are not always quoted exactly, or in full. This may be due to the limits imposed by the circumstances or purpose of the quotation, or to the defectiveness of the person's memory who makes the quotation. This inaccuracy does not seriously affect the statements we have just made; however, for it is the form that is of importance, and that which determines the form, namely, the quoter's attitude toward that which he is quoting.

¹ The fact that *ὅτι* is sometimes used to introduce direct quotations, as well as indirect (Goodwin, M. and T. 711), does not prove in the least that the two constructions are alike, or have anything to do with each other. The direct quotation is just as direct as ever, and *ὅτι* merely takes the place of the colon or the quotation marks (cf. the article on this construction by E. H. Spieker in A. J. P. V, 222); or perhaps it would be more correct to say that certain verbs are in their ordinary use so almost invariably followed by a subordinate clause introduced by *ὅτι*, that the conjunction becomes more closely associated with the verb of saying than with the following clause. Compare Ford, The Honorable Peter Stirling, p. 335, "Leonore informed him that: 'Mamma makes me (Leonore) leave after supper, because she doesn't like me to stay late, so I miss the nice part'".

If then we find a subjunctive, or an infinitive, used in indirect quotation, we need not give ourselves up to wondering how these forms came from the indicative of the direct quotation, with which they have no more in common than the mind of B has with the mind of A, but we may be sure, if the indirect quotation has different persons, moods or tenses, that all these things are in some way due to the different mental attitude and point of view on the part of the reporter, when compared with those of the original speaker. The problem which remains for us is, merely, to discover, if we can, what this different relation to the idea on the reporter's part is, and, if possible, to understand in what connection the use of particular moods, as it is found in indirect quotation, stands with other uses of these moods. Unfortunately, in making this attempt, we are compelled by the lack of corresponding evidence in Greek, to confine ourselves to the subjunctive in Latin and German. Whether or to what extent, if at all, the evidence in these languages should be allowed to raise a presumption in favor of a similar explanation in Greek, is a question which we need not discuss. The phenomena which present themselves to us in Latin and German, at any rate, are so closely parallel in this field, that the relation between these languages, at least, can not be doubtful.

The use of the subjunctive and optative as moods of indirect quotation appears, from the available evidence, to date from a later time than the use of the indicative for the same purpose. We have already called attention to the absence of the optative of indirect statement in Homer, and to the larger use of the indicative of indirect quotation in early Latin. In early German, also, the indicative seems to have occupied a comparatively wider field.¹ This course of development agrees with what we must assume to have been the natural line of progress from a psychological point of view also. For if the power and habit of discriminating between ideas as to their truthfulness, is one which is slowly acquired with the growth of the mind, then the primitive attitude toward ideas expressed by others cannot have been essentially different from that toward ideas of native production. From the standpoint of the two languages which we are considering, this would mean that all these ideas were once expressed indiscriminately by the indicative. For the difference in meaning which exists between the indicative and the subjunctive as moods

¹ Cf. Behaghel, *Gebrauch d. Zeitformen*, p. 163.

of indirect quotation, is precisely this, that the subjunctive expresses the idea which is felt to be foreign, as opposed to the idea which one is able to treat as one's own, and which is, by way of distinction, expressed by the indicative. And if the realization that another's ideas are something apart and different from one's own, is a later development, the use of the special mood which reflects the mental attitude toward these foreign ideas must also be of later origin.

We may still, with some confidence, trace in outline the conditions under which this use of the subjunctive may have first entered the language. For we still have a form of expression, in both Latin and German, which we can easily imagine to be the earliest use of the subjunctive to reflect the status, in one person's mind, of an idea previously expressed by another. To realize the full significance of this construction, however, and its peculiar force, we must try to put ourselves back into those primitive conditions when the indicative was used indiscriminately for expressing the ideas of others as well as one's own.

The earliest distinction which the primitive mind makes, and for a long time, no doubt, the only one, is that between experiences which give pleasure and those which give pain. And as the ideas of other people do not, as such, belong either to one or to the other of these categories, it is but natural that they should long remain undistinguished from those of the person himself. A difference was, of course, felt in a dim sort of way even then, but until the mental powers became keener and more sensitive, this difference was not of enough consequence to the individual to effect a recognition in speech. More than that, the fact that the indicative, not to mention the infinitive, was already installed as the regular mood of quotation, would in itself act as a powerful obstacle to any innovation. We shall probably not be going too far then, if we assume that the new mood of quotation did not take its place beside the original indicative, until the incompatibility between foreign and native ideas had come to be felt so strongly that the emotions aroused by it broke through the crust of linguistic habit with revolutionary violence.

If such were actually the conditions of its origin, the new construction could, of course, not be a calm adaptation of the existing indicative, such as we found, for instance, when this mood was supplemented by the addition of a paratactic verb of saying. We shall rather look for a somewhat forcible ex-

pression of the incompatibility of which we have spoken, for the exclamatory form, and for circumstances which exclude pre-meditation. Such circumstances will have the merit, too, of presenting the problem to us in its simplest form. For the calmer the hearer's state of mind and the longer his time for reflection is, the more complicated the new idea will become. It will, in fact, no longer be the same idea that was conveyed to him by the speech of the original speaker, but one which has been developed from it through his own intervening mental process.

Bearing these points in mind, we shall examine first those cases in which an original expression of will or desire is instantaneously reflected in a rejoinder by the one to whom it is addressed. This course seems the desirable one for the reason that in such cases there will no doubt be full agreement as to the particular force of the mood. A reading of Plautus brings to light the frequent use of dialogue passages like the following:¹

Bacch. 627 a, b:

Pi. Non taces, insipiens? *Mn.* Taceam?

Pi. Sanus satis non es. *Mn.* Perii.

Capt. 139-41:

He. Ne fle. *Erg.* Egone illum non fleam? egon non defleam

Talem adolescentem? *He.* Semper sensi filio

Meo te esse amicum et illum intellexi tibi.

Men. 1023-5:

Mes. Ergo edepol, si recte facias, ere, med emittas manu.

Me. Liberem ego te? *Mes.* Verum: quandoquidem, ere, te servavi.

Me. Quid est?

Adolescens, erras.

A command, request, or suggestion to act, is addressed to a person, and is immediately rejected by him in an exclamation of

¹ A number of additional cases were noted by the writer, and some others have no doubt, escaped him: Asin. 700, Curc. 10, Bacch. 1189, Cist. 284, Curc. 182, 553, Epid. 573, 587, Merc. 727, 749, 895, Mil. Gl. 496, Most. 578, 618, 633, Persa 186, 747, Poen. 351, 315, Pseud. 625, 1226, 1314, 1327, Trin. 513.

In addition, some exclamations introduced by *quid*, *quo* and *unde* should also be mentioned here. They follow upon a command like those just given, and their force is much the same: Bacch. 44, 406, 731, 691, Capt. 839, 843, Curc. 599, Most. 581, Pseud. 96, 1183, 1326, Rud. 842, 938, 1334, Trin. 968, 981, Most. 577.

In two cases a clear future indicative is used in the exclamation, instead of a present subjunctive, Men. 197 (*saltabo*) and Merc. 915 (*manebo*).

surprise, which repeats the verb of the command or its equivalent, in the first person singular of the present subjunctive, and thus reflects the command as it lies in the mind of this person, and from his point of view. That the exclamation is practically a refusal to follow the command or request, is plain from the further remarks. Had the command been accepted by the person addressed, he would have gone about its execution without saying anything at all, or would simply have stated the fact of his performance of the act by the use of the present (or if future performance, of the future) indicative. Such cases are frequently found at the end of scenes in comedy, when an actor leaves the stage. So in Capt. 953:

Philop. Sequere hac, Philocrates, me intro. *Philocr.* Sequor.

It does not require a long argument to show that in the cases where the subjunctive exclamation is used, the command or request meets obstacles in the mind of the person to whom it is addressed, that is, the impulse to perform the act in question clashes with other impulses which exist, more or less clearly, in his mind, with the result that these other impulses retain the upper hand. By this contest between the two sets of impulses the whole process becomes so vigorous and takes on such importance in the mind, that it becomes clearly conscious, that is, it occupies the centre of the mental stage and, as we say, attracts the attention. And when the person becomes thus conscious of the struggle, the two opposing forces in it necessarily stand out more or less distinctly, no longer as impulses merely, but as ideas. Whether they are primarily impulses or primarily ideas, will depend very much on individuals and circumstances, but it will also depend on the nature of the original utterance. Other things being equal, an utterance which calls, not for an act, but merely for consent or acquiescence on the part of the hearer, will arouse in him a state of mind in which there will be less of impulse and more of idea than would be the case where the utterance is a command or request to act. But in the former, no less than in the latter, the rejecting exclamation is in the subjunctive. So in Bacch. 1176-7:

Ba. Sine, mea pietas, te exorem. *Ni.* Exores tu me?

So. Ego quidem ab hoc certe exorabo.¹

¹Other cases in Plautus are Persa 134, Cas. 366, Rud. 1063, 1064, Poen. 316, Asin. 669, 697.

We further find the same subjunctive of exclamation used in cases where the original speaker has made merely a statement of his intention, which calls for action or participation on the part of the person addressed only in a slight degree, if at all.¹

Mil. Gl. 497-8:

Sc. Expurgare volo me. *Pe.* Tun te expurges,
Qui facinus tantum tamque indignum feceris?

Curc. 494-6:

Ca. Memini et mancipio tibi dabo. *Cu.* Egon ab lenone quicquam
Mancipio accipiam, quibus sui nil est nisi una lingua,
Qui abiurant, siquid creditumst?

The fact that the clash in these two cases is primarily between ideas, is made especially clear by the expression, in addition to the rejected idea, also of its rival in the mind of the person who utters the exclamation.²

If it appears then that the subjunctive in Latin is used to reflect a state of mental conflict between native and foreign elements, not only when these elements are impulses, but also when they are ideas, it will not surprise us to find the subjunctive in cases where the foreign element is presented as an idea, to begin with, in a simple statement by the original speaker, containing no reference to prospective activity whatever, either on his part or that of the one whom he is addressing. And cases of this kind are also found in considerable number.³

Amph. 817-8:

Al. Quid ego tibi deliqui, si quoi nupta sum tecum fui?
Am. Tun mecum fueris? quid illa impudente audacius?

¹ Examples in addition to those given above are Asin. 756, 628, Persa 338, Rud. 723, Cas. 454, Merc. 567, 575, Persa 295, Trin. 378.

² That the rejoinder deals with an idea and not with a volition, is clear also from the fact that the negative is always *non*. Compare one of the passages given above (Capt. 139-40).

³ Other cases of the rejection, by the subjunctive exclamation, of an idea either expressed or suggested by another person, are Aul. 682, Amph. 813, Curc. 119, Asin. 482, Mil. Gl. 963, Poen. 149, Epid. 225, Truc. 626, Mil. Gl. 1275, Most. 301, 1026, 132, 923, 924, Men. 683, Merc. 154, Capt. 208, Cas. 111, 114, Pseud. 228, 486, 516.

There is also one case where the place of the subjunctive is taken by *ais* and the infinitive (Truc. 288). There are further two cases (Asin. 812 and Phorm. 970) in which a parenthetic *ain tu* is prefixed to the exclamatory subjunctive.

Most. 1016-8:

Th. Quod me apsehte hic tecum filius
Negoti gessit. *Si.* Mecum ut ille hic gesserit,
Dum tu hinc abes, negoti? quidnam? aut quo die?

Curc. 615-7:

Ph. Virgo haec liberast.
Th. Mean ancilla libera ut sit, quam ego numquam emisi manu?
Ph. Quis tibi hanc dedit mancipio aut unde emisti? fac sciam.

Andria 915-7:

Pa. Bonus est hic vir. *Si.* Hic sit vir bonus?
Itane attemperate evenit, hodie in ipsis nuptiis
Ut veniret, antehac numquam?

The very close connection between these exclamations and those in the preceding class, is shown by the fact that, like them, those at present under discussion also, in the majority of cases, have the rival idea added as a sort of reason, why the idea of the other person can not be accepted. It is also to be noticed particularly, that in spite of the way in which they are generally introduced (*-ne*), and always punctuated by the editors, these expressions are not really questions. The clearest proof of this is the fact that a direct reply is rarely made, and then only in a way which shows that the person making it understands that the exclamation is what we have called it, namely, a definite and positive, even if not absolutely final, expression of the speaker's unreceptive attitude toward the foreign idea.¹

The function of the subjunctive just treated, in so far as it expresses the status of this foreign idea in the speaker's mind, is therefore just the same as the function of the subjunctive in indirect discourse. That is to say, the two uses of the mood agree in reflecting the status of an idea previously expressed, or at least conveyed, by another person, which is found to be incompatible with certain other ideas in the mind of the person addressed, and is therefore not admitted by him among these ideas, but

¹ Exclamations like those of which we have spoken above, are used also when a thought or a line of action occurs to a person, which has not been communicated to him by another, but is nevertheless unacceptable to him, as in Bacch. 490:

Mn. Perdidisti me, sodalis. Egone ut illam mulierem
Capitis non perdam? perire me malis malim modis.

is held aloof as a foreign element in his mind.¹ It is surely not unreasonable to hope from this agreement of the two uses of the subjunctive, that the one will prove, in still other ways, to be closely related to the other.

Our confidence in this conclusion is measurably increased, when we find that these exclamations in the subjunctive, which follow and reflect previous statements by other persons, stand in the same general relation to other exclamations in the indicative, uttered under similar circumstances, as we know that the subjunctive in indirect discourse stands to the indicative in indirect discourse. And such exclamations with the indicative, which reflect the idea of one person in the mind of another, can fortunately be found in Latin comedy in sufficiently large numbers to enable us to draw a sound conclusion. They are like the exclamations with the subjunctive in that many of them have the enclitic *-ne* appended to the first word, and also in that they reproduce more or less accurately a part or all of the preceding speech of the other person. But they do, at the same time, differ from them in several important particulars.

In the first place, the indicative exclamations are very short, as a rule, the great majority containing but one or two words each. In the second place, while most of the subjunctive exclamations contain a subordinate clause, or some other addition that presents the rival idea in the speaker's mind, which clashes with the foreign idea and prevents its acceptance, this is almost never the case in the indicative exclamations. At least, among the 61 cases counted by the writer in Plautus, only two instances of such an addition are found.² In the third place, we judge from the remarks which are made in answer to the indicative exclamation, that it is much more like a question than we found the subjunctive exclamation to be. For while the latter hardly ever received an answer in the true sense of the word, the former is answered in about four-fifths of the cases. Indeed, it is often hard to decide in a given instance of the indicative class, whether we have an exclamation or a genuine question before us.

¹ Hypotactic forms of this use of the subjunctive in exclamations of rejection are no doubt to be recognized in the comparative *ut*-clause (*quam ut*), in the *ut*-clause in expressions like *non credibile est ut*, and in the rejected reason, introduced by *non quo*, etc. While the ideas in these clauses are not as a rule quoted from other persons, they are nevertheless recognized by the speaker as foreign matter in his own mind.

² Merc. 305 and Pseud. 471.

The absence of a rival idea in the case of the indicative exclamation, together with the replies just referred to, will give us a clew to the status of the foreign idea in the mind of the person from whom the exclamation proceeds. Of course it is evident at once, that the idea conveyed in the original speaker's statement is not promptly and readily accepted or assimilated by the person whom he has addressed. For if it were, an exclamation of surprise would not be the result. But it is also clear that the delay in the acceptance of this foreign idea is not, to any extent, due to the presence of another idea which is opposed to it. This is the sort of obstacle which we found to exist in the case of the subjunctive exclamation, and as it was there generally expressed as a part of the exclamation, we should expect it to be expressed here also, if it were present in the speaker's mind. But as we find only traces of it in the indicative exclamation, the hindrance which exists to the acceptance of the foreign idea, must therefore, in this case, be, on the whole, of a different nature.

As the exact difference between the indicative and the subjunctive exclamation must have been clear to the one who had made the original statement and whom we will call A, and as he would therefore understand exactly what the status of the idea was in the mind of the person to whom he had addressed it (B), we will do well to study the remarks which A makes in reply to B's exclamation, if we wish to understand the latter. For it must above all be to A's interest to have B accept his idea, and, consequently, to remove whatever stands in the way of such acceptance. And just as the comparative absence of effort on A's part in the case of the subjunctive exclamation showed that he realized that the status of his idea in the mind of B was fixed and hard to change, and that B had definitely refused to accept it, so in the case of the indicative exclamation the almost invariable continuation of A's efforts shows that he has hopes of removing the obstructions which the fact of the exclamation shows to exist to the entrance of his idea into the mind of B.

In the great majority of cases, the remarks made by A in answer to B's exclamation consist in repetitions of his original statement, or the essential part of it, with or without an affirmative or asseverative addition. Several examples will illustrate.

Amph. 361-2:

Sō. Tun domo prohibere peregre me advenientem postulas?

Me. Haecine tua domust? *Sō.* Ita, inquam.

Bacch. 680-1 :

Mn. Quia patri omne cum ramento reddidi.

Ch. Reddidisti? *Mn.* Reddidi. *Ch.* Omne? *Mn.* Oppido.

Epid. 712-3 :

Ep. Merui ut fierem. *Pt.* Tu meruisti? *Ep.* Visse intro: ego
faxo scies

Hoc ita esse.

Merc. 304-6 :

De.

Amo.

Ly. Tun capite cano amas, senex nequissime?

De. Si canum seu istuc rutilum sive atrumst, amo.

Merc. 760-2 :

Co. Nempe uxor rurist tua, quam dudum deixeras

Te odisse atque anguis. *Ly.* Egone istuc dixi tibi?

Co. Mihi quidem hercle.

Poen. 404-5 :

Ad. Non sum irata. *Ag.* Non es? *Ad.* Non sum. *Ag.* Da ergo,
ut credam, savium.

Ad. Mox dabo, quom ab re divina rediero.

In all these cases it is plain that A hopes by his remarks to impress his idea more fully upon B. We must conclude from this fact that he feels, either that B has not heard his words distinctly, or that he has been taken by surprise and needs help to concentrate his thoughts upon the idea, or that the idea in itself is so strange to B, that it requires time and repeated effort for him to grasp it. In any of these cases, however, B's attitude toward the idea is receptive, and his mind is on the road to acceptance, so far as it has gone. When he will have reached the end of his mental process, if he ever does, the idea will be fully accepted by him as one of his own, so far as the circumstances of the exclamation help us to form a conclusion.

The indicative exclamation reflects then an acceptance or assimilation of the idea partially accomplished, with an attitude of mind on the part of the person who utters the exclamation, that is favorably inclined to full acceptance. This attitude is fundamentally different from that reflected in the subjunctive exclamation, by which, as we saw, the foreign idea was definitely rejected, because of its incompatibility with another idea which was firmly intrenched in B's mind, and over which A, to judge from his remarks, or rather his absence of remarks, felt that he could exert but little, if any, influence. The two constructions,

therefore, clearly stand in the same relation to each other, as that which exists between the subjunctive in indirect discourse, by which the speaker gives the idea as that of another, without accepting it or assuming any responsibility for it, and the indicative in indirect discourse, by which the speaker expresses one of his own ideas, or the idea of another which he is himself willing to accept and treat as his own.

Before we pass on to examine the corresponding constructions in German, it is worth while to observe that our theory of a close relation between the subjunctive of exclamation and the subjunctive of indirect statement, is still further supported, in Latin, by the existence of the two precisely similar uses of the accusative and infinitive. Corresponding to the subjunctive of exclamation there is an accusative and infinitive of exclamation, which reflects the same general mental attitude on the part of the one who utters it, toward the idea which forms its content. The exclamation with the infinitive differs from that with the subjunctive in being somewhat less vigorous, and we find it used in those passages which do not so much express resistance or opposition to an idea, as a helpless inability to make it harmonize with the other ideas and particularly with what seem to the speaker to be the known facts in the case. But this is a difference of emotion or tone only, and so far as their mental status is concerned, the ideas in both cases occupy the same position, namely, that of a foreign element in the mind of the person who utters the exclamation.¹

Turning now to German we find a very close correspondence between the uses which it makes of the subjunctive in the fields under discussion, and those in Latin. For this mood is employed, in both languages, not only in indirect quotation, but also in exclamations of rejection, whether they are uttered in reply to expressions of will and desire, or to statements of ideas. A few examples under each head will serve to illustrate.

1. Exclamations following an expression of desire.

Goethe, *Egmont* (Act 4):

Egmont. Der König schreibe einen Generalpardon aus, er beruhige die Gemüter.

Alba. Und jeder, der die Majestät des Königs, der das Heiligtum der Religion geschändet, ginge frei und ledig hin und wieder!

¹ Curc. 694-5. Pro deum atque hominum fidem:

Hocine pacto indemnatum atque intestatum me abripi?

For other examples see Holtze, *Syntaxis Prisc. Script. Rom.* II, p. 44 and 263-4.

Lessing, Nathan d. Weise, 3449-51:

Nathan. Dank sei dem Patriarchen—

Tempelherr. Dem Patriarchen? Dank? ihm Dank? wofür?

Dank hätte der bei uns verdienen wollen?

2. Exclamations following statements or suggestions of ideas.¹

Lessing, Nathan d. Weise, 384-5:

Derwisch. Zwar wenn man muss—

Nathan. Kein Mensch muss müssen, und ein Derwisch müsste?

Schiller, Maria Stuart, 3310-3:

Elisabeth. Ich hab's gesagt, und quält mich nun nicht weiter.

Davison. Du hättest es gesagt? Du hast mir nichts

Gesagt—O, es gefalle meiner Königin

Sich zu erinnern.

The form and environment of these exclamations in German are closely parallel to those which are found in Latin. The rival idea is often expressed by the person rejecting the foreign statement or request, as we see it in several of the examples just quoted.

Fortunately, too, there is in German a second form of exclamation, with exactly the same function as the one just mentioned, which confirms our conclusions as to the origin and meaning of the subjunctive construction even more fully. In this second form, the place of the subjunctive is taken by the auxiliary *sollen*, to which the verb is then added in the complementary infinitive.

1. Exclamations following a command or request.

Nathan der Weise, 2783-6:

Saladin. Sei ruhig, Christ!

Tempelherr. Was? ruhig, Christ?—Wenn Jud'

Und Muselmann, auf Jud,' auf Muselmann

Bestehen, soll allein der Christ den Christen

Nicht machen dürfen?

Goethe, Goetz v. Berlichingen, II, 6:

Weislingen. Seht mich nicht so an.

Adelheid. Willst du unser Feind sein, und wir sollen dir lächeln? Geh!

¹ These are quite common, especially in the classical authors. Other cases, besides those given above, are Nathan d. Weise 1042-4, 2311, 2348, Schiller, Maria Stuart 83-85, 693-7, 827-8, 2716-23, Wilhelm Tell 1823-4, Fulda, Der Talisman 1442.

Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*, 1895-8:

Gessler. Du wirst den Apfel schiessen von dem Kopfe
Des Knaben—Ich begeh'r's und will's.

Tell. Ich soll
Mit meiner Armbrust auf das liebe Haupt
Des eignen Kindes ziehlen?

2. Exclamations following an expressed or suggested idea.

Nathan d. Weise, 2875-8:

Nathan. Das alles ist ja dein, und keiner andern.

Daja. Ist mein? Soll mein sein? Ist für Recha nicht?

Wilhelm Tell, 438-41:

Stauffer. So kann das Vaterland auf euch nicht zählen,
Wenn es verzweiflungsvoll zur Notwehr greift?

Tell. Der Tell holt ein verlornes Lamm vom Abgrund,
Und sollte seinen Freunden sich entziehen?

Maria Stuart, 827-8:

(After a long speech of Maria)

Burleigh. Und eine Stuart sollte dieses Glück
Dem Reich gewähren?

Now *sollen* (the English *shall*) is the German auxiliary of obligation, and expresses ordinarily what is expected of some one or what another person wants him to do. It serves then to reflect the status in one person's mind of an expression of will by another. But its use to reject foreign statements, as well as foreign commands, when taken with the observations which we have already made in Latin, shows beyond a doubt that both the statement and the command were felt to occupy the same position in the mind of the one to whom they had been addressed, that is to say, that not only the expression of a command, but also the statement of an idea by one person, involves an obligation on the part of the other to whom it is addressed.¹ And really, the acceptance and assimilation of an idea, especially in the face of an opposing idea firmly fixed in the mind, requires exertion no less than the performance of a command. If the task in either case presents insurmountable obstacles, it is given up, indignantly flung back, as it were, in an exclamation with the subjunctive, or

¹ This obligation is sometimes distinctly recognized in the Latin exclamation also, as in *Pseud.* 316-18. *Ps.* Ego in hoc triduo | Aut terra aut mari aliquonde evolvam id argentum tibi. | *Ba.* Tibi ego credam?

with *sollen*, for that is the form which expresses the state in which the exclaimer feels the idea to exist for him, as an obligation, namely, imposed from without.

We may now go one step further. The performance of the command and the acceptance of the idea may be of such a kind that they are felt to be a task, but without arousing indignation, that is, while still recognized by the person concerned as incompatible with his other inclinations or ideas, they may, without being accepted by him or acquiesced in, be merely held in abeyance in his mind and recognized as existing, but only as so much foreign matter. In case they are then expressed, the two kinds of exclamation with *sollen*, which have just been given, would lose their emotional character and would become calm statements. The first, following a command or request, would be the acknowledgment of an obligation to act, and the second, following the statement or suggestion of an idea by another, would be the acknowledgment of the presentation of this idea, an acknowledgment which in itself, to be sure, amounts to a feeling of obligation to accept it. Psychologically, it is not difficult to harmonize the two uses of *sollen*. Quotation, like all other forms of expression, reflects primarily not the words of another, but a certain mental state of the person himself. If the word *sollen* is associated, therefore, with a feeling of prospective labor, which has been aroused by some communication from another person, it does not so much matter what the precise form of this communication was. The feeling of obligation may, for instance, be aroused quite as well by a gesture or a frown, as by a spoken command. Why then may it not be aroused also by the statement of an idea, if the hearing of this statement gives the hearer a sense of labor to be performed, be it physical or mental? In both cases a non-existent state of things is to become an existing state. The only difference is that, in the case of the command to act, the stage upon which this transformation is to take place, is the world of fact, in the case of the pure statement it is the world of ideas. Thus it comes about that *sollen* is in German not only the sign of obligation in the ordinary sense of the term, but of indirect statement as well.¹

¹ An instructive comparison may be made with the Greek acc. and inf. after verbs of saying and thinking, where the negatives *μή* and *οὐ* serve to distinguish between *Wille* and *Vorstellung*. See a recent article by Gildersleeve in the *Journ. of Philos. Psych. and Sci. Meth.* (Feb. 16, '05), p. 95, and his article on the "Encroachments of *μή* on *οὐ* in Later Greek", *A. J. P.* I 45 ff.

Wilhelm Tell, 3010:

Herzog Johann soll irren im Gebirge (It is said that—).

Seidel, Leberecht Hühnchen:

Er soll in der Gartenstrasse wohnen, allein über die Hausnummer war ich nicht im Klaren.

That the recognition of the existence of another's idea does actually amount, in the end, to a feeling that a demand is made upon one by that person, as would seem to be the case from this use of *sollen*, is proved still more clearly, perhaps, by another very interesting line of evidence, both in German and in Latin. This evidence is furnished by certain uses of the reverse of *sollen*, namely *wollen* in German, and *velle* in Latin. This auxiliary is employed in both languages to reflect the status of ideas which are held and expressed by another, but are not accepted by the speaker himself.

Seidel, Leberecht Hühnchen:

Lore will gehört haben, dass er gehustet hat, allein das ist wohl ein Irrtum.

Lessing, Minna v. Barnhelm, III, 1:

Ein Briefchen von meinem Herrn an das gnädige Fräulein, das seine Schwester sein will.

Ibid., III, 5:

Aber was sind das für Dienste, die der Wirt unserm Major will erwiesen haben?

Terence, Eun. 248-9:

Est genus hominum, qui esse primos se omnium rerum volunt,
Nec sunt.

Cicero, Pro Caelio, 21, 53:

Si tam familiaris erat Clodiae, quam tu esse vis cum de libidine eius tam multa dicis, dixit profecto, quo vellet aurum.

Cic., De Orat., I, 55, 235:

Sit sane tanta, quantam tu illam esse vis.

Velle has, moreover, a very extensive use as a means of quoting the religious or philosophical views of another person.

Cicero, De Nat. Deor. III, 14, 36:

Ita voltis, opinor, nihil esse animale intrinsecus in natura atque mundo praeter ignem.

(For other cases, see Lex. s. v.)

The value of these constructions for our present purpose, is that, in a way, they take the place of the independent subjunctive clause of indirect quotation, which the literary language no longer

recognizes. That is, while the constructions with *sollen* for instance, closely correspond to and duplicate the various subjunctive constructions which we have mentioned, the former alone have been found to be sufficiently explicit and free from ambiguity, to be admitted into a highly developed language as an independent form of indirect statement, without the limiting addition of a verb of saying or thinking. The reason for this is that the auxiliary *sollen* is itself a highly specialized word, and is not used to express so many shades of meaning as the subjunctive or the indicative. Therefore, the necessity of adding other words to distinguish one use from another, is far from being so great in the former case as it is in the latter.

It should be noted, however, that a study of the German dialects would, in all probability, reveal the presence, to a certain extent, of the subjunctive in independent clauses of quotation also. In one dialect, at least, spoken on the northern border of the Palatinate, the writer can vouch for such a use of the mood. To be sure, it can be used only under certain well-defined conditions. The general nature of the preceding conversation may, for example, be of such a kind as to fix clearly the status of the utterance without the addition of a verb of saying. Or, even when that is not the case, a quotation may still be made by an independent subjunctive clause, if the particle *ei* or *ja* is used in it.¹ Thus "er wär' heimgegangen" would ordinarily mean "he would have gone home", while "er wär' ja heimgegangen" means "they say he went home".

We may now, for German, establish a complete chain of relations between the subjunctive exclamation of repudiation on the one hand, and the subjunctive of indirect quotation on the other.

1. Rejection of a command	Subjunctive or <i>sollen</i> .
2. Rejection of a statement	" "
3. Independent clause of quotation	" (in dialect) "
4. Quotation in parataxis, with added verb of saying	"
5. Quotation in hypotaxis (main clause)	"
6. Quotation in hypotaxis (subordinate clause)	"

In Latin, at least in the Latin of literature, as we know it, several of the links in this chain of subjunctive uses are almost,

¹ It should be noticed, however, that these particles do not, in performing this function, lose their ordinary force. They still retain it, as in the following passage from Goethe's *Goetz v. Berlichingen* (I, 1), in which however the verb of saying is present, "Es heisst ja, alles wäre vertragen und geschlichtet".

or entirely, lacking, namely 3, 4, and 5. We could hardly expect to find 3, of course, in a language of which the colloquial and dialect forms have so largely disappeared. The absence of 5 could also be easily accounted for by the supremacy which the accusative and infinitive acquired at such an early date in Latin, crowding out not only the subjunctive, but the indicative also, from the main clause of the quotation. And if the subjunctive in hypotaxis was crowded out of the literary language, we are not surprised at its absence in parataxis.¹ But after all is said, it would still be strange, if with such clear illustrations of subjunctive use as those in 1 and 2, and with such universal prevalence of the mood as we find it in 6, the intervening links were entirely lacking in Latin. It seems all the more strange when we recollect that many of the subjunctive exclamations that are used to reject the ideas of another person, are introduced by one of the commonest of subordinating conjunctions, namely by *ut*.²

That the subjunctive clause with *ut* actually was at least a potential form of indirect quotation, is shown by a certain number of cases in which it was used for this purpose in place of the accusative and infinitive, especially by later writers whose style reflects the colloquial speech. A collection of examples is found in the dissertation by Mayen (p. 59 ff.) already referred to. The earliest instance of this use of the clause with *ut* Mayen finds in Hyginus, De Astrologia II, 34, De hoc fertur, ut sit Arcas nomine. Other passages given by him are Pliny, N. H. XVI, 74, Dicunt ut . . . sub terra sit luna; Pliny, Epp. XVI, 5, Credidit ut redirem; Gellius, VII, 14, 4, Quando . . . aut spes magna est, ut is, qui peccavit, . . . se ultro corrigat, aut spes . . . nulla est, emendari eum posse.³ A case very similar to this last, in which the clause with *ut* and the accusative and infinitive are found in coordination, may be added to the list from Terence, Hec., 145-7:

Narratque ut virgo ab se integra etiam tum siet,
Seque antequam eam uxorem duxisset domum,
Sperasse eas tolerare posse nuptias.

¹ We have, however, cases of a paratactic *ain tu* with a rejecting exclamation in the subjunctive, namely Plautus, Asin. 812, Terence, Phorm. 940. (These are taken from Becker, Beiordnende u. Unterordnende Satzverbindung, p. 23)

² Compare, for example, Most. 1017, Mecum ut ille hic gesserit | Dum tu hinc abes, negoti? Other cases in Plautus are Aul. 682, Mil. Gl. 963, Epid. 225, Most. 132, Curc. 616, Men. 683, Pseud. 516.

³ To these cases and the others cited by Mayen, might be added Justin, I. 5, III 1, XII, 12 XXVIII 3, Pliny, N. H. VII 2 and 13, XV 28, XXVIII 125.

As an illustration of the intermediate stage of development between the use of the clause with *ut* as an independent exclamation of repudiation, and its subordination to a verb of saying or thinking, we may cite Cicero, Tusc. I, 15, *Quid in hac republica tot tantos viros ob rem publicam interfectos cogitasse arbitramur? isdemne ut finibus nomen suum quibus vita terminaretur?* (Cf. also Plautus, Amph. 694-5.)

But though the evidence is quite sufficient, in early as well as late writers, to show that the subjunctive clause with *ut* was a potential form of indirect quotation, which might become an actual form whenever the supremacy of the accusative and infinitive was broken, it was, after all, not this clause, which finally inherited that supremacy, but another, namely the clause with *quod*.¹ For some time both kinds of clauses seem to have been used in quotations side by side, but the latter finally prevailed. The causes which led to this turn of affairs were, perhaps, partly, that the *ut*-clause was too closely associated with strong rejection, as in cases like *non est credibile ut*, etc., but especially that *quod* had throughout its whole history been used both with the subjunctive and also with the indicative, and that it could thus, by its two moods, not only designate clearly the thoughts and words of another, but could also make a distinction among these thoughts, between such as the reporter would himself vouch for, and such as he would not.² This was a distinction which even the accusative and infinitive was not able to make. Hence when regard for classical precedent began to die out, and the latter construction was thrown upon itself in the struggle for existence with another construction which was more definite and more highly specialized, the result was what we might expect. The older but less flexible construction was gradually driven from the field.

If now we attempt to classify the subjunctive of indirect quotation and to determine the relation in which it stands to other uses of the mood, we find ourselves inevitably at variance with what seems to be the prevalent view, so far as a definite view is expressed, namely, that it is a variety of what is usually called,

¹ For full statistics see Mayen, p. 4 ff. The earliest case cited by him is Bell. Hisp. 36, 1, *Legati Carteienses renuntiaverunt quod Pompeium in potestate haberent*. There is a case in Plautus, Asin. 52 after *scio*.

² That such distinctions were actually made in late authors, is shown, for instance, by Reiter, *De Ammiani Marcellini usu orationis obliquae*, p. 39 ff.

somewhat loosely, the potential subjunctive. The reason why it can not belong to this class is plain when we recall briefly its real function and psychological character. We found that the subjunctive of indirect quotation reflects the status of a foreign idea in the mind of the speaker, that it merely expresses his recognition of the presence of this idea in his mind and does not in any way vouch for the idea or include it in his own assertion. The status of such an idea, and, consequently, the function of the mood which expresses it, is therefore very different from that which we find in the case of the potential. For in the potential the total content of the speaker's mind, or individual parts of this content, stand in such a relation to the particular idea which is being expressed, that, instead of preventing its admission, they lead the speaker to a partial or conditional acceptance and affirmation of the idea. In the case of the subjunctive of indirect quotation, on the other hand, any kind of acceptance and affirmation of the idea in question is expressly withheld.

The subjunctive of indirect quotation is rather one of what we may call the reflex uses of the mood, that is, it gives expression not to a mental or emotional impulse from within, but to a reaction which follows upon an impulse from without. That the reaction is not always exactly equivalent to its cause, or in other words, that the mood of the quotation is, in certain cases, not the same as that of the original speech by the other person, is due to the peculiarities of the medium through which the impulse given by the original speech has to pass, that is, to the peculiarities of the mind of the one who hears this speech and reports it. If obstructing ideas are present in his mind, the acceptance of the foreign idea will, of course, require effort on the part of this person, if indeed the acceptance takes place at all. If the original speaker foresees the difficulty in the mind of the hearer and makes allowance for it, or if he should have the same difficulty with the idea himself, he will naturally present the idea in the form of a command or suggestion to the imagination, he will ask the hearer to assume it or will himself concede it. In a case like this he will, of course, use the subjunctive. If, on the other hand, the speaker does not foresee any obstacle in the hearer's mind to the acceptance of the idea, or if, foreseeing it, he pays no heed to the obstacle, he will then merely make a statement of the idea in the indicative, that is, he will use that form which implies that the idea is a fully assimilated part of his own mental stock, and that

he takes its acceptance by the hearer for granted. To the mind of the hearer, however, the idea may, in the latter case, be as difficult of acceptance as in the former, or if there is a difference, it may be merely this, that the calmness and presumption of the expression by the indicative will serve to rouse his indignation. When that happens, the resulting utterance on his part will naturally be exclamatory. But in any case, the presentation, for acceptance, of an idea that meets obstacles in his mind when he hears it, is, from his point of view, as much a demand upon his mental activities, as an order to climb a tree is a demand upon the muscles of his arms and legs. And to express the status of this idea from his point of view, in the former case, the use of the subjunctive is just as natural as is the use of the same mood to express the status of the command in the latter case.

If, on the other hand, the idea presented by the original speaker agrees with the hearer's own ideas, if it readily and naturally takes its place in his mind and is accepted by him without difficulty or reserve, then the attitude of his mind toward this idea will naturally be expressed by the indicative, for this attitude will then be no different from his attitude toward any of the ideas which make up his own mental stock.¹ In other words, the status of the new idea will now be the same in his mind as it was before in the mind of the original speaker, when the latter expressed it by the indicative.

TERRE HAUTE, IND.

JOHN J. SCHLICHER.

¹ It is, of course, still possible, even then, to assign the idea formally to the original speaker, if there is any object in doing so.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

FERDINAND SOMMER, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins.* Heidelberg, 1902. (Pp. xxiii + 693.)

Of the manuals dealing with Latin phonology and inflexion this excellent work meets probably best the wants of the classical student who has not given much time to systematic study of comparative philology and who values it chiefly in so far only as it explains definite facts of Latin phonology or serves to unravel the tangled skein of the Latin paradigms. Addressed primarily to beginners, the author has succeeded in keeping their needs constantly before his eyes not only in the matter of explanatory paragraphs and notes where references to unfamiliar Indo-European languages were required, but also in presenting the material in such a way as to deviate least from the traditional and accustomed manner of our Latin grammars. The latter is especially true of the morphological part (p. 336-652). I know of no grammar in which the inflexional system of the Latin is more conveniently and clearly analyzed, where the explanation of the living speech material, the 'regular forms', (which, of course, is of prime importance to the beginner and the teacher) maintains so evenly its prominence throughout as compared with the space devoted to isolated and, from the point of view of the Latin philologist, merely curious Indo-European survivals which the comparative philologist rejoices in finding embedded in the Roman amber. The close contact which Sommer so successfully maintains with classical philology might, it seems to me, be advantageously still increased by greater fulness in two directions, viz., in the matter of philological details and in regard to the references to native Roman grammatical literature, especially to the earlier writers. It is mainly for its wealth of material along these lines that Lindsay's book appeals so strongly to the classical scholar. Compare, for instance, Lindsay-Nohl p. 439 with Sommer p. 430 § 249 (forms of *rei*) or Lindsay-Nohl p. 611 with Sommer p. 620 § 375 (use of *-ēre* and *-erunt*). Especially the references to Latin grammatical writers are often interesting and instructive. I give a few examples to illustrate the point: (P. 86 § 64) The spelling *EI* for *I* was criticized by Nigidius (Gell. xix, 14, 8).—The same Gellius (iv, 6, 6) notes the change of *ae* to *i* in the unaccented syllable of compounds (p. 115 § 75, III, 1).—His *diſſequintī* (x, 24, 1) illustrates the law of brevis brevians (p. 142 § 84, 4).—P. Lavinius' *sculna* (Gell. xx. 11. 2) is an excellent ex-

ample of protonic syncope (p. 150 § 86) in the spoken language.—The two collateral forms *complura* and *compluria* (p. 419, bottom) are discussed at length by Gellius v, 21, and *silenta loca* (xix, 7, 7) should be added.—The genitive *-uis* (p. 422 top) was favored by both Varro and Nigidius (Gell. iv, 16).—On the use of *nostrum* and *nostri* (p. 443 § 275) see Gell. xx, 6.—On *trēs*, *tris* (p. 494 § 306) see Gell. xiii, 21, 10.—On *mille* (p. 500 § 310), Gell. i, 16.—To the formation of the ordinals for 18 (p. 503, end of § 312) add Fabius' *duovicēsimus* (Gell. v, 4, 3).—*Assentio* (p. 508 § 318) was fathered by Sisenna (Gell. ii, 25, 9).—(P. 591 § 368, 1, a) Gell. vi, 9 discusses the subject of reduplication. With regard to *sciciderat* it should be noted that cod. R of Priscian reads *sci-scid-* (cf. KZ. xxx. p. 436.).—The perfect *stiti* (p. 592 § 368, 1, 6) is treated by Gell. ii, 14, 1 and *descendidi* (p. 593 § 368, 1, d) in vi, 9, 17.—Quintil. i. 4, 17 *leber* might be added to p. 93 § 68, 1 end.—Tinga's *precula* for *pergula* (Quint. i. 5, 12) to p. 301 § 164, A, 2, a.—Vergil's *miis* (Quint. viii, 3, 25) to p. 446 § 282, 3.—*Dua pondo* (Quint. i. 5, 15) to p. 493 § 306.—*Dederont* and *probaveront* (p. 619 § 375) are mentioned by Quint. i. 4, 16. In connection with the double form of the 3 person plur. of the perfect it might be stated that some (Quint. i. 5, 42, cf. Jeep 215) regarded the form in *-re* as a dual.—From Livy the old formula *arbori infelici aliquem suspendere* (Liv. i. 26, 6) might be quoted to p. 412, end of § 225; and *pluvit, pluvisse* (Prisc. X, 11 = i. p. 503, 14 H) to p. 606 (bottom).—Cicero, de orat. iii, 183 is important on account of *illtus* (p. 457 § 487, b, β).—A reference to Cicero's Orator 157 should accompany that to Quint. i. 6, 17 on p. 610 § 371.—*Isse* for *ipse* (p. 257 § 134, 3, a) was the Emperor Augustus' pronunciation (Suet. Oct. 88, cf. Fröhde Rh. M. xiii, 148; Mohl, Chronol. d. Lat. vulg. p. 156).—The etymological connections of *nuntius* with *novus* (p. 175 § 94, 4) and of *iudex* with *ius* and *dicere* (p. 252 § 133, 1, b) go back to Varro LL. vi, 58, and vi. 61 respectively.—The discussion in Varro's fragm. 47 (Wilmanns, De M. T. V. lib. gramm. p. 177) shows that the differentiation between surd and sonant treated on p. 256 § 134, 3, a, in the note, was a purely orthographical not an orthoëpic question.—In connection with p. 291 § 160, 2 it is interesting to note that Varro wrote *narare, naratio* (Wilmanns, De M. T. V. lib. gramm. p. 179, fragm. 53).—The fusion of consonantal with i-stems is well illustrated by Varro, LL. viii. 66.—etc. etc.

Having used the book in a course on Latin Grammar I might also venture to suggest that the number of references to the other Italic dialects might be increased in a subsequent edition. There are enough advanced students who have a first hand, if elementary, knowledge of Oscan and Umbrian (and with Buck's excellent manual their number will grow) to make such comparisons possible and highly instructive. Thus Oscan *essuf* Umbrian *esuf* (Planta II p. 211 § 288, 2, e) throws doubt on the derivation of *ipse* from **ispse* (p. 459 § 298); so does the Oscan *imaden* (Planta I p. 380 § 184, Buck, A Gramm. of Osc. and Umb.

p. 76 § 114 d) on Thurneysen's derivation of *imus* from **ismos* (p. 488, bottom).—The Faliscan *foied* 'hoc die' could be referred to on p. 431 § 253.—The transition of *ē* to *i* (p. 77 § 56, 3) is attributed by Mohl (Chron. d. Lat. vulg. p. 118) to Oscan influence.—An even better illustration to p. 423 § 236 than the Sanskrit *sānāu* would be the Umbrian *m a n u v-e* where the diphthong of the ending remained before the preposition (Planta II p. 161 § 279, 6).—(P. 444 § 278) The couple *lou-os*: *tu-os* is paralleled by Oscan *sū v-ad*: *su-ve f s*, Umbrian *lou-er*: *tu-er* (Buck, A Gramm. of Osc. and Umb., p. 140 § 194, a).—Oscan *ce-bnust* illustrates Lat. *cē-dō* (p. 477 § 299, 1, f and p. 586 § 363).—(P. 495 § 306) The Samnitic forms of the numerals 'four' and 'five' appear in the proper names *Petronius* and *Pompeius* (p. 207, end of § 117).—A reference to the Oscan and Umbrian distinction of primary and secondary verbal endings should accompany § 323 B, p. 518-19.—With *tuli*: *fero* (p. 519 § 324) compare Umbrian *anferener* 'circumferendi': *andirsafust* (*ateřafust*) 'circumtulit' (Buck, A Grammar of Osc. and Umb. p. 166 § 217).—With Latin *vel* (from *velle*, p. 581 § 360, 1) compare Umbrian *heri* (s), *herie* (i) (Planta II. p. 474 § 347).—(P. 591 § 368) A comparison of the Umbrian and Oscan reduplicated and unreduplicated perfect forms with those in Latin would be useful.

An occasional reference to the Romance languages might also be convenient, e. g. for *h* as syllabic divisor (p. 171, foot-note) compare Nyrop, Gram. hist. d. l. lang. franç. p. 366 § 487, 1 and p. 227 § 279, no. 3; EDVCAVT (p. 619 top) might be marked as the precursor of the Italian weak perfect in *-o*.

The need of compression and the necessary absence of discussion make some statements unavoidably appear to be more dogmatic than they were really intended to be. The chief danger is that the beginners who use the book may be misled into believing that certain doctrines are more securely established and universally accepted than is really the case. It ought to be pointed out, for instance, that Thurneysen's (BB. viii. 275) explanation of the Latin imperfect subjunctive (p. 570 § 353) makes it very difficult to account for the peculiar Italic uses (Planta II. p. 475, line 17 ff.), so difficult, in fact, that Brugmann now (KV Gr. II p. 588 § 769, note) discards it.—In § 270 (p. 440) the quantity of the *i* in *mis*, *tis* appears anything but certain.—Sittl's explanation of the genitives in *-aes* (p. 354 § 192) does not seem to me to commend itself by strong inherent probability, cf. Planta II. p. 87-88 § 271, Buck, A Gramm. of the Osc. and Umb., p. 115 § 169, 12.—Nor is *nihil* necessarily for *nihilum* (p. 376 § 209) since a stem **hili-* (neuter **hile*) is not at all impossible.—(P. 137 § 83, 7) Sommer concludes the absence of weakening proves the length of the second *a* in *adāxim*. But the *a* may be short and retained through the influence of the preceding *a*; *adāxim* would then be to *effāxim* as *adāgium* is to *prōdīgium* (Lane² § 104, d). If we measure *adāxim* we shall also have to measure *atrāctus*, which S. apparently rejects, for he measures *vēctus* with

ē (p. 642, top) and quotes *tractus* along with it (p. 640 § 389, Bemerkungen, 1).—(P. 229 § 125, 3, b, γ and p. 584 § 360, 5, b) S. derives *māvōlō* from **mage-volō*. Why should it not, by the phonetic development discussed on p. 260 § 137, 2, c, have come from **magz-volō* for **mag(i)s-volō* as Havet and Solmsen (Stud. z. lat. Lautgesch. p. 57) assumed?—(P. 234 § 127, 3, b) The rule concerning the anaptyctical *p* in *mpl* (e. g. *exemplum*) is stated too categorically ("jedentfalls"). Brugmann, Grundriss I² p. 370 § 413, 9, Anm. 4 called the rule "irrig" but admits its possibility ("vielleicht") in KVGr. I p. 231 § 322, 1. The Latin *plumbum* is connected by Schrader (Reallexicon p. 96) with *πλινθος*.—(P. 286 § 159) I have not been able to convince myself of the correctness of Sommer's phonetic explanation of the aspirated letters in *triumphus*, *pulcher*. The force of the argument which he bases (p. 288) on the aspiration of the *c* in *anchora* where the Greek shows *k* (*ἄγκυρα*) does not seem to me strong enough 'to remove all doubt'. There is no reason to suppose that after the aspiration had once become a characteristic of Greek words, it should not have crept in where it did not belong, exactly as we find hyper-doric and hyper-aeolic forms in the artificial Doric and Aeolic of late authors. I think it is still fairly safe to adhere to the old explanation and see in the whole process a phenomenon comparable to the change of Latin *au(c)tor* into English *author* (cf. E. Koeppl, Spelling-Pronunciation; Quellen u. Forsch. zur Sprach- und Culturgesch. (1901), Heft 89). To the cases usually given in illustration of this change may be added two etymologies from Macrobius for which the interchange of *p* with *ph* and *t* with *th* is essential: 1, 12, 8 '*secundum mensem nominavit Aprilem, ut quidam pulant cum adspiratione quasi Aphrilem, a spuma quam Graeci ἀφρόν vocant*'; 1, 8, 9 '*propter abscisorum pudendorum fabulam etiam nostri eum Saturnum vocitaverunt παρὰ τὴν σάθην quae membrum virile declarat, veluti Sathunnum* (correct to *Sathurnum*?)—Clifford Moore (this Journal XIX p. 312) removes Cato's difficult subjunctives DICAIE FACIAIE (p. 303, § 166 and p. 572 § 355) by a suggestion which convinces through its simplicity. He interprets the final letter as Ξ i. e. an *M* laid on its side, an attempt to represent the weak sound of final *m* exactly parallel to Verrius Flaccus' sign Λ (p. 33 § 8, 9).—Why should it be objectionable to interpret the long *far* of Ovid (p. 413 § 226, I, B) in the same way in which Plautus' long *ter* and *cor* are interpreted (p. 309 § 169, A)?—Thurneysen's change of parent Italic *-nt* to *ns* (p. 310 § 169, B, 2) should have been marked as very problematic rather than 'wahrscheinlich'. The Oscan secondary ending of the third plural *-ns* certainly does not reflect a Parent Italic *-nt* (Planta I p. 513, Buck, A Grammar of Osc. and Umb. p. 81 § 128, 1).—(P. 314 § 173) The paragraph on syllabic haplology needs to be revised in view of Pekrowskij's discussion KZ. xxxv. p. 247-253.—To the remnants of duals (p. 344 § 184) should be added *octo* (p. 495) and the possible duals POMPLIO and CES-

TIO (see the literature in IF. XIV p. 31). A reference to these two should also be added after § 209, p. 377.—Sittl's explanation of the genitives in *-aes* (e. g. FEMINAE) is put forward too dogmatically, since connection with Sabellic forms (Planta II. p. 87-8, Buck, A Gramm. of Osc. and Umb. p. 115 § 169, 12) seems not at all improbable.—Mohl's explanation (Chron. du Lat. vulg. p. 51) of the Emperor Augustus' genitive sg. *domos* (p. 421 § 235) as being a Volscian form and comparable to the Umbrian *trifor* seems more plausible than Sommer's suggestions.—(P. 426 § 242) Why should not the gen. plur. *passum* for *passuum* be due to the same process of analogy formation which produced *agricolum* (p. 359 § 198 end)?—(P. 429 § 248) Since the loss of *u* in *eu* before *-s* is problematic it would seem safer to regard, with Brugmann KVGr. II. p. 312 § 381, *diēs* as an analogy formation after *diem* (**diēm*) and to compare the similar extension of the stem **bō-* in Umbrian (Buck, A Gramm. of Osc. and Umb. p. 131 § 183, 2 and note *b.*).—(P. 445 § 281 Anm.) I can see no reason why Italian *vostro* should not be a direct continuation of the old Latin *voster* which continued to exist by the side of the urban *vester*.—(P. 446 § 282, 1) Sommer's explanation of the vocative *mī* seems to me as improbable as it does to Brugmann (KVGr. II. p. 411 § 522, 1), but the older explanation which Brugmann thinks at least probable (*ibid.*) does not seem to me convincing either, and Sommer's objection to it (viz. that we should then expect *mī* in all genders and numbers) appears to be well grounded. I would suggest that we have here, as in so many cases, a transfer of the termination of one word to another one with which it forms a closely knit group; i. e. *mī* takes its *-ī* from the endings of *fiī* and other words with which it was habitually combined, exactly as Oscan *p ūs* "qui" *ekas* "hae" took the endings of the following nouns. The great mass of such cases are commonly classed as examples of 'functional association' (the third group in B. I. Wheeler's classification;¹ Thumb and Marbe² call them "Grammatische Analogiebildungen," Wundt³ classes them as "äussere grammatische Angleichungen"). I pointed out in my Lectures on the Study of Language (p. 156-7) that examples of this association of words simply because they are functionally alike do not appear in any of the purely experimental investigations

¹ Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language, Cornell Univ. Studies in Class. Phil., 1887.

² Experimentelle Untersuchungen über die psychologischen Grundlagen d. sprachlichen Analogiebildung, 1901, p. 61.

³ Völkerpsychologie I. Die Sprache I, p. 448. He contrasts these cases, where the inflectional form of one word influences the same form of an etymologically different word (Tags: Nachts) with those in which different inflectional forms of the same word influence each other (starb: starben). These latter he calls "innere grammatische Angleichungen" (p. 447). On the relation of this latter group to Paul's "stoffliche gruppe" (Prinzipien³ 1898 p. 96 § 75) cf. Delbrück, Grundfragen (1901) p. 108, Sütterlin, Das Wesen der sprachlichen Gebilde (1902) p. 50; Delbrück, Einleitung⁴ (1904) p. 170.

which psychologists have furnished. And ever since the experiments which I made five years ago and of which I published a small part in this Journal (XXII p. 221-267) my distrust of the correctness of the current explanation of such cases has constantly increased. While the material at my disposal does not permit me wholly to deny the existence of cases of functional analogy I am inclined to favor another possibility, viz. the transfer of the termination of one word to an adjacent word simply on account of local contiguity. We must remember that in actual speech words do not ordinarily occur isolated but are almost always combined in phrases. The experiments regarding word-associations have all been made on isolated words. The question how freely associations are formed when the word occurs set in a sentence has not as yet found an answer. And yet it is quite plain that the isolated word will act differently from the connected word. Now, when we consider that words like the article or pronouns habitually occur in closest proximity to the noun they qualify, and, further, that words with like grammatical function cannot help being placed together in very many instances it does not seem at all surprising if—without any reference whatever to their functional likeness—the ending or the accent¹ of one member of such a group should encroach upon that of the other member, especially if both form a phonetic unit². Such interference may operate in either a forward or backward direction and in its mechanical character it would not differ from the so-called regressive and progressive assimilations of sounds within the same word (Brugmann's "Fernassimilationen," e. g. KVGr. I p. 235-239 § 329-333). Isolated instances have already been thus explained. "Transfer of endings," says Wackernagel (IF. XIV. 374), "is not only due to proportional analogy but also to the fact that the words affected are construed together . . . Hence the influence of pronominal words on nouns." And he appears to regard in this light the transfer of the ending *-es* which appears first as accusative in petrified numerals like *τέτορες* and thence spread over the adjacent nouns.³ This principle, it seems to me, applies, if not to all, at least to the great majority of the supposed cases of functional analogy.⁴ After the experi-

¹ For the latter cf. Brugmann, Ber. d. Sächsischen Gesellschaft d. Wiss. for 1900, p. 371.

² 'Word' as 'sentence' is a semantic term, without any standing in phonetics, cf. Sweet, Words, Logic and Grammar, in Trans. of the [London] Philol. Soc. 1875-6 p. 472 f. and Jespersen, Lehrbuch d. Phonetik, 1904, p. 202 § 210.

³ Cf. also O. Hoffmann's note to SGDI. vol. iii, no. 5224, p. 268, on *τέτορες* as nominative.—J. Schmidt (KZ. xxxvi, p. 400) explains the Cretan nominatives plural in *-ev* (*ἀνέν, τινέν, μαλ' ἔπειν*) in the same way and gives other instances of the adequation of pronominal endings to verbal terminations.

⁴ A very good example is found in the warrant for the arrest of Bunyan (Facsimile in W. H. White's John Bunyan (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904) and reprinted in the Nation for Jan. 26, 1905 = no. 2065 p. 80): "... yett one John Bunnyon of yo^r said Towne Tynker hath divers times within one month last past in contempt of his Maj^{ties} good Lawes *preached or teached* at a conventicle meeteing or assembly . . ."

ments¹ with numerals which were published in this Journal (XXII (1901), p. 261-267) and which coincide exactly with the results Ebbinghaus obtained (Zeitschr. für Psychol. und Physiol. d. Sinnesorgane XIX (1902) p. 142) I cannot believe that in a case like Heracl. ὀκτώ or El. ὀπτά (both after the analogy of ἐπτά) the association of the two numerals was based upon their grammatical category, for the experiments showed that even in the case of isolated numerals such associations are excessively rare. I am now inclined to believe that the frequent juxtaposition of these words and their local contiguity in counting, without any reference to their grammatical category, lies at the bottom of the change, nor should I hesitate to extend this explanation to cases like 'Nachts' after 'Tags' and many others. The coherence of the members of a phrase in the spoken language is much greater than is usually supposed as is proved by those instances (rare enough, to be sure, in the revised written texts) in which one member of a frequent word-group may be caught carrying in its train its unwelcome mate which far from being useful may be positively disturbing. Interesting cases of such 'agglutinative association'² may now be found in Kemmer's *Die polare Ausdrucksweise in d. griech. Litteratur*,³ and they are occasionally met with in English, as when Col. Henry Watterson writes: "It ['Life'] is racy of the soil, even as Punch in London is racy of English soil, a reflection of *the moods and tenses* of the time, of the thoughts and fancies of the people". Such cases are lexicographical counterparts to those phonetic alterations in which one word of a phrase appropriates the final sound of the preceding or the initial sound of the following word, e. g. German 'Meisenbühl' from 'im Eisenbühl'.⁴—(P. 511 § 319, 6) When

¹ These results are really incommensurable with those of Thumb and Marbe and the more recent ones of H. J. Watt (Zeitschrift für Psychol. und Physiol. d. Sinnesorgane xxxvi, 1904, p. 417 ff.) because of the essential difference of method. In my experiments I did not for a moment propose to test the correctness of Thumb and Marbe's results—*ne sutor supra crepidam!* My purpose was to find how frequently an isolated numeral without any 'connective setting' (Kries' 'connective Einstellung', Zt. f. Psych. u. Phys. d. Sinnesorg. viii, 1895, p. 1) would associate another numeral. Their method, on the other hand, rather "invited the association of correlative ideas" (Wundt in *Indo-germ. Forsch.* xii, Anzeiger, p. 20). Why, for my purpose, the exact measurement of the reaction time should be 'sehr wesentlich' (Watt, l. c. p. 425) is unintelligible to me. Going over my records I also find that the elimination of secondary and tertiary associations, to which both Marbe (*Amer. Jour. of Psychol.* xiii, 1902, p. 350) and Watt (l. c. p. 426) object, does not affect my percentages. Nor are they essentially affected if I discard all but the first associations. The figures then are: In class I eleven (twelve) cases, in II four, in III seven, in IV three, in V two, in VI none, in VII (association of another numeral) one, in VIII one; that is one case out of twenty-nine (thirty).

² Cf. my *Lectures on the Study of Language*, p. 183 § 16.

³ In Schanz' *Beiträge* XV, p. 2; 45; 50; 57.

⁴ In an editorial of the Louisville Courier-Journal reprinted in 'Life' xiii (1903) no. 1099, p. 479.

⁵ Cf. Zt. f. d. deut. Unterricht xvii (1903) p. 728. A great number of English examples are collected by C. P. G. Scott in *Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* xxiii (1892) p. 179 and xxiv (1893) p. 89.

Sommer says that the sigmatic forms are originally simple presents and owe their later future meaning to the 'futurische Sinn der Wurzel' I take it he refers to the 'Aktionsart'. If so, the case should be stated a little more fully.—(P. 521, § 326) The reference to the 'vorhistorische Akzentgesetz' (p. 96 § 71) may mislead some to suppose that the old accentuation of *afficiō* was due to the recessive accent law instead of being due to the old enclisis of the verb.—Since the *-ā-* and the *-ā-īo-* verbs are inextricably mixed in Latin (Brugmann, KVGr. II p. 504 § 658 and p. 532 § 694, 3) the assumption of contraction for *plantās* (p. 557 § 338 a) seems unnecessary; and *nāre* (p. 539 § 330, 1) is not a safe example for an unthematic root verb (cf. Sansk. *snā-ya-te*).—(P. 543 § 332, 2 and p. 598 § 369, 2, c, β) Curtius' connection of *ἵημι* with *iēcī*, *iacio* (cf. Hirt IF. xii. p. 229) seems to me preferable to Sommer's with \sqrt{se} .—(P. 545 § 332, 4) The quantity of the vowel of the third conjugation *-io-* verbs before the inchoative suffix *-scō-* might be determined by Priscian (II, 429 H): '*omnia . . . secundae personae primitivi addita 'co' fiunt*' which would give *labāscō*, *fervēscō*, *sciōscō* but *cupiscō*, unless his rule disregards the quantity of the vowel of the endings of the second person of the primitive verbs.—(P. 551 § 333) I agree with Buck (A Gramm. of Osc. and Umb., p. 166 § 216, note) that iambic shortening was not the sole reason for forms of the type *capis*. See also Brugmann KVGr. II. p. 525 § 690, 2 with the note.—(P. 559 § 345) There seem to be neither phonetic nor semantic reasons which would militate against *plantēs* being an old optative form **plantā-īē-s* (cf. *Planta* II. 293).—(P. 618 § 375) The explanation of the long *i* in the third person sg. of the perfect (*vicit*) by analogy to the first person (*vici*) does not seem to me preferable to the theory which sees in it the old third person middle in *-ai* (or *-ei*, *-oi*, Brugmann KVGr. II. p. 595 § 788, 3) with the conjunct termination *-t* added.

I close with a series of minor additions which I noted while using the book with a class in Latin Grammar.—(P. 89 § 65, 2, b) Mohl's theory that the variation between *oe* and *ū* was due to accentual differences (*poēna* : *pūnīre*) might have been added (Chronol. d. Lat. vulg. p. 159). The theory accepted by Sommer fails to account for *moenia* : *mūnīre*.—(P. 91 § 66) Mohl (Chronol. d. Lat. vulg. p. 160) restricts the change of *au* to *o* to atonic syllables (*adrum* : *orātus*).—(P. 128 § 79, 3 B) Hirt (IF. xii. p. 241) restricts the 'o-Umlaut'.—(P. 133 § 82) Among the sources for the determination of 'hidden quantities' the *clausulae* of rhythmic prose (Lane², p. 5 § 34) should certainly be added. The papers of Wolf and Zielinski contain some very interesting observations bearing on quantity in prose Latin; a long *i* for *fiēbant* (p. 589 § 366), for instance, is established by II Verr. 4. 110. In a similar manner the accentual *cursus* of the later prose writers may be utilized. By it *interiit* (p. 612, end of § 372) was established by Mr. Harmon for Ammianus xxx, 2, 12 and xv, 3, 10 and frequent synizesis (p. 144 § 85) for the termination *-ia* in names of

countries (Ammianus xiv, 10, 4; xv, 10, 10; xxxi, 2, 5 and 16, 9).—(P. 181 § 98) Add *Aubia*[no] and *Aubia* from CIL xii. 5111 (Zt. f. roman. Philol. xxv. 735), and in note² add a reference to Mohl's etymology of *ater* (*dies*) in Chron. d. Lat. vulg. p. 277.—(P. 222 § 124, 2, d, a) Add *aemulus* (from **adiemolos*, Thurneysen KZ. xxxii, p. 566) and *aerumna* (from **adiærumna*, Brugmann, IF. xii. 401).—(P. 223) Somewhere here should be added a paragraph dealing with the assimilation of *ri* to *ii* to account for *peiierō* from **per-ierō* (Brugmann IF. xii. p. 400).—(P. 223 line 2 from bottom) Add *Geronsia* CIL xii, 2116+.—(P. 232 § 126, 3, b) For *taeter* cf. Osthoff, Etym. Parerga i. p. 162.—(P. 233 § 127, 1) Hirt (IF. xii. 224) connects *lāna* with *λάνη* which would bring it under § 141, 2, c.—(P. 241 § 129, change of *gn* to *rn*) Add the spellings like *mana* for *magna* collected in Zt. f. rom. Phil. xv. p. 735-6. I do not feel certain that the first *n* in *singnifer* (other instances in Rhein. Mus. lvii, p. 316) is simply a graphic anticipation (p. 302 § 165, 2). It may well be a device to spell *rn*, cf. Nyrop Gramm. hist. de la l. franç. p. 271 § 333 note.—(P. 301 § 164, A, 2, a) It should be stated that *interperlor* for *interpretor* (Consentius p. 392, 24) is probably due to the derivation from *inter partes* (Bergk, Philol. xiv, p. 185).—(P. 308 § 168, e) Add *fa* (Zt. f. rom. Phil. xxv. p. 735).—(P. 353, foot-note) The Oscan asigmatic nominative of Greek proper names (Planta II. p. 85) is paralleled in Latin by *Pelia*, *Euthia*, *Hermagora*, *Aeneia*, *Anchisa* (Quint. i, 5, 61).¹—(P. 364 § 203, b) Add *citer*, Cat. orat. fr. 62 p. 65 J.—(P. 402 § 220, I, C, 2, b) Bechtel (NGGW. 1899, p. 185 reads *liēn*, as *compōs* (p. 398 § 220, I, A, 1).—(P. 406 § 220) In discussing the nominatives sg. in *-ēs* a reference to p. 403, § 220, D should be added to show that some, like *plebēs*, are really *s*-stems. For *nubēs* cf. Richter, KZ xxxvi. p. 114.—(P. 407 § 221). The ending *-us* for the genitive sg. (which Mohl, Chronol. d. Lat. vulg. p. 152 regards as Sabine, cf. Sittl, Lokale Verschiedenh. p. 40) should be compared with the ending *-us* of the second person middle (p. 536 § 328).—(P. 410, end of § 224) Add *Herclēs* (KZ. xxxii. p. 196).—(P. 449 § 284, b, δ). The form IVM in CIL ix. 782 (Luceria) makes it certain that Varro's *iam* (cf. Christ, Arch. f. lat. Lex. ii. p. 622) is not a lapsus calami.—(P. 453 § 286, b, a) HEC also in Atti d. R. Ac. d. Lincei, Series V, vol. 6, May, p. 185, no. 6.—(P. 495 § 306, 4) Wharton, Etym. Lat. p. 83 separates *quadra* from *quattuor*, cf. KZ. xxxii. p. 565.—(P. 497 § 308) For VI-

¹ These forms are valuable because they help showing that the early Greek loanwords reached Rome not directly but by way of Samnitic channels. General historical considerations make such an assumption probable enough, but it is also positively supported by the peculiar phonetic form of a number of these early loans. The anaptyctical vowel in words like *Alcumena*, *mina* etc. (Ritschl, Opusc. ii. p. 509) gives to these words a distinctively Samnitic flavor; the change of *d_h* to *s* and of *t_h* to *s* which was peculiar to the dialect of Bantia (Planta i. p. 412, 386) appears in *rosa* from *podēa* (Planta, l. c., end of note 3) and *brisa* from *βpύrea*.

GENTI refer to Arch. f. Lat. Lex. vii. p. 69-70. The form VEIGINTI (cf. also CIL x. 6009) belonging, as Sommer himself states, to the period when EI and I were confused, should be removed from the argument.—(P. 498, end of § 308) The syncopated form *quadra[gi]nta* must also be read in CIL. vi. 28047.—(P. 499 § 309) To *trecenti* and *trepondo* add Varro Men. 310 B. *tremodia*.—(P. 526 § 328, forms like *danunt*) A reference to Delbrück's (Vergl. Syntax iv. p. 131) comparison of the Slavic present forms like *stanę* might be added.—(P. 547) Somewhere here the desideratives (*esüriō*) and frequentatives (*dormitō*) should be mentioned.—(P. 566 § 349, forms like *opsequito*) Add Cicero's *nititō* (Diomed. 340, 1 K.).—(P. 576, § 358, 1) With *simus* compare Sardinian *bolimus* (= *volimus*, p. 581, § 360) Muhl, Chron. d. Lat. vulg. p. 319, Planta i. p. 317 note.—(P. 648) Somewhere toward the end of the discussion of the formation of past participles a few words should be added concerning adjectives entering the verbal system with the function of past participles, e. g. *saucius*, cf. Lindsay-Nohl p. 620, 623.

The indices are excellent; in fact the whole book gives plain evidence of great pedagogical skill such as we do not always find combined with profound learning, and when slight blemishes¹ which are unavoidable in a first edition have been removed it will prove, as it is even now, one of the most convenient and reliable helps to introduce the classical student to scientific Latin Grammar.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

HANNES OERTEL.

Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen von WILHELM SCHULZE, Berlin, 1904; M. 40; pp. 647 (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Neue Folge, Band V. Nro. 5.).

The interesting subject of Latin proper names has been repeatedly brought to notice and treated from different points of view in recent years. Notable are the discussions published in 1898 in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, Supplementband XXIV, by J. Schwab (Nomina propria latina oriunda a participiis praesentis, etc.) and by W. Otto (Nomina propria latina oriunda a participiis perfecti) and the recent valuable articles of A. Zimmermann in Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie (XIII, pp. 225 ff., 415 ff., 475 ff.). But these and others that might be added are all partial in their scope, dealing only with the proper names of some particular formation, of some distinct locality, or of some author or department of literature. The work of Schulze, on the other hand, is far more extensive than any previously undertaken and

¹ Especially the inconsistency in the marking of long (hidden) vowels e. g. *Sestius* (p. 269 and 502) where the *ē* is well established but difficult to account for (Froehde, BB. xvi p. 204).

aims not only to set forth all the material furnished by literature and inscriptions—without overloading pages with references otherwise easily accessible—but to classify as far as possible on a basis of origin, formal, dialectal, or geographical.

In the first chapter (*Keltische Namen, Illyrisch-venetische Namen, Neubildungen nach lateinischer Analogie*, pp. 3-61) one sees how the gradual spread of Roman culture, language, and then citizenship throughout the empire caused the extension also of the Roman method of using names and created a demand for new family names. This demand was met not only by the formation of Latin names of foreign origin but also by the use of genuine Roman *cognomina* as a basis for the making of new family names. These names of secondary formation are now for the first time made the subject of a thorough treatment, in which questions of chronology and geographical position receive due attention. Names of Etruscan origin are considered in the second chapter (pp. 62-421), which is a systematic presentation and comparison of Latin and Etruscan names with the purpose of showing the relationship between them where any existed. This study yields results of definite value for the student of Etruscan inscriptions as well as for the student of Latin names, but leaves many a problem for the special investigator, who will now find his materials more ready to his hand than ever before. In the third chapter (*die lateinischen Gentilnamen*, pp. 422-521) those names which show gemination of consonants are first discussed by the author, who here confines himself as a rule to the Italian field. By the aid of inscriptions he attempts, as far as possible, to localize different names and classes of names, wisely recognizing that evidence drawn from *C. I. L.*, vol. VI, is of less value because of the cosmopolitan and heterogeneous character of the population of capital. Great care is taken to trace the relation of secondary formations to their primitives and results are sometimes stated in tabular form (e. g., pp. 432 ff.). After a section devoted to words derived from names of the gods, the whole Roman system in the use of names to distinguish individuals is satisfactorily set forth from the historical point of view. The last chapter is entitled *Gentilnamen und Ortsnamen* (pp. 522-582). Nearly complete as the treatment is, it does not obviate the necessity of reading the admirable sketch of J. Wackernagel (*zu den lateinischen Ethnika*) in *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie*, XIV, pp. 1-24, which appeared about the same time as Schulze's book was published. Several pages of additions and corrections, followed by full and well classified indices, conclude this monumental work, which, though it raises almost as many questions as it answers, is invaluable to students of Latin and the Italic Dialects.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, VOL. XXVIII.

No. 1.

1. Pp. 5-32. The Recruitment of the Roman Army of Egypt in the first and second centuries, by Jean Lesquier. This is a thorough investigation of the sources from which soldiers were drawn and the manner and conditions of enlistment. Incidentally the two uses of the word *ἐπίκρισις* in a technical sense are discussed. The article is of great importance to those who are interested in the history of the Roman army or Roman military affairs.

2. Pp. 33-40. On a Manuscript of Cicero de Inventione, by Jules Lebreton. The MS is in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, D. 3. 36. It extends from *bestiis praestare* (120. 30) to *loco producendo* (218. 26). It has never been collated nor even reported. The author describes it, discusses briefly its relation to other MSS, and collates it with the text of Friedrich. The departures from this text occupy five closely printed pages.

3. P. 41. René Pichon emends Orac. Sibyl. VIII. 299, so as to read *ἀλλ' ὅτε ταῦτ' ἄν ἅπαντα κτέ.*

4. P. 42 f. Louis Havet interchanges vv. 331 and 332 of Plaut. Trin., and reads (332) *Mercaturan? an venales?* [Pause.] *Vbi rem perdidit?*

5. Pp. 44-48. Louis Havet emends six passages of Phaedrus.

6. P. 48. In Ov. Met. 8, 150 Louis Havet proposes *spuma ruit* for *pluma fuit*.

7. Pp. 49-55. Latin Studies IV. Félix Gaffiot explains some apparent instances of the indicative in indirect questions after verbs such as *visere*, *observare*, in Plautus, Terence, and Horace.

8. P. 56. A note by F. Gaffiot à propos of an article by Prof. Antoine (Musée Belge, Oct. 15, 1903) on the mood of iteration in Latin.

9. Pp. 57-59. Louis Havet shows that the *De Chorographia* of Pomponius Mela is composed under rhythmical laws like those of Cicero.

10. P. 60. In the *De Mortibus Persecutorum* XIV, 4 f., René Pichon reads *torquebant*, *urebant*, *certantes* etc.

11. Pp. 61-64. *Varia*, by Jules Nicole. 1) Emendation of scholion on Ar. Nub. 156 ff.: for *σφάξαις* read *σφίξαις*. 2) In Ar.

Equ. 1179 for *τόμον* read *γόμεν*. 3) Between vv. 667 and 669 of Verg. Aen. III. something corresponding to the analogous occurrence in Hom. Od. IX is wanting, whether lost in copying, or resulting from the incompleteness of the poem as left by Vergil.

12. Pp. 65-68. A Text of Genesis, by Jules Nicole. In 1896 the author procured at Ghiseh a small piece of parchment containing Gen. XXXVII, 3, 4, and 9, in a mutilated condition. It is in Greek, but is from a version that is not only quite different from the LXX, but was very probably made from a different Hebrew text.

13. P. 69. Louis Havet calls attention to the fact that in MSS of a certain long period the halves of M are like A, and cites several instances of errors originating from this fact.

14. Pp. 70-76. Inscriptions of Clazomenae, by Victor Chapot. The author publishes and discusses four inscriptions, two on mile-stones, two on grave-stones.

15. Pp. 77-80. Book Notices. 1. J. Vendryès. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les effets de l'Intensité initiale en latin*. Reviewed by A. Ernout, who commends the work as a whole, but enumerates a considerable number of what he considers errors. 2. Two works reviewed together by Albert Martin. a) *Scholia Aristophanica* by William G. Rutherford, London, 1896, Vols. I and II; and b) *Studien zu Aristophanes und den alten Erklärern desselben*, Theil I, von Adolf Römer, Leipzig, 1902. The reviewer, admiring the painstaking care and energy of Rutherford, considers the labor in great measure wasted. He then states the very hostile attitude of Römer's work to Rutherford's, and concurs with Römer's views for the most part. He finally discusses briefly the question as to the number of the copyists that wrote the Ravenna MS of Aristophanes, and the distribution of their work.

No. 2.

1. Pp. 81-102. Loan Contracts of Amorgos, by J. Delamarre. This article contains much of great interest to historians. Several inscriptions are critically examined and their bearing on the history of the Cyclades pointed out. Sometimes a single letter, or even part of a letter in a fragmentary inscription is made to contribute an important fact.

2. Pp. 103-121. The Gigantomachia of Ovid, by H. de la Ville de Mirmont. In this article the whole subject of the Titanomachia and the Gigantomachia is discussed, and also the references made by Ovid to his having written or having intended to write a poem on the subject. The conclusion is that he did begin, and may well have finished, such a poem, but was deterred from publishing it by Augustus, as the poem was probably a sort of allegory in which Jupiter was Augustus, and the adulation was such as to make him ridiculous.

3. P. 122. M. L. Earle proposes to suppress Soph. Ant. 46, retaining 45 intact by supposing an ellipsis of *τάφον* implied from 44.

4. Pp. 123-124. M. L. Earle emends six passages of Cicero's Cato Maior.

5. P. 125. Louis Havet proposes in Auson. Technopaegnion 12, 25 haec crucis effigies Palamedica porrigitur *F* (pronounced *Fav*).

6. Pp. 126-131. Latin Studies, by Félix Gaffiot. V. Explanation of ut in Ter. Hec. 378, and Hor. Sat. I. 4, 13. VI. The Prologue of the Heautontimoroumenos. The author defends the integrity of the text and maintains that there is nothing in the Prologue to show that the play is a contamination.

7. 132-135. The omission of *εἶναι* with *ἔτοιμος*, by E. Harry. In this article it is shown that the tendency to omit the copula with *ἔτοιμος* has been greatly exaggerated, and that in the great majority of examples, it is present.

8. Pp. 136-150. Louis Havet critically discusses and emends twenty passages of Plautus. It is needless to call attention to the importance of this article.

9. Pp. 150-168. Book Notices. 1. A. Meillet. Introduction à l'étude comparée des langues indo-européennes. Paris, 1903. A. Grenier describes and highly praises this work, which is intended for people not familiar with comparative grammar, but may be read with profit by all. 2. Poetarum Graecorum fragmenta auctore U. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff collecta et edita. Voluminis III fasc. prior Poetarum philosophorum fragmenta edidit Hermannus Diels. Berlin, 1901. Albert Martin describes this work, highly commending it in every respect. 3. Bibliotheca Gothana. C. Sallusti Crispi de Bello Jugurthino liber. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von J. H. Schmalz. Sechste verbesserte Auflage. Gotha, 1904. Félix Gaffiot pronounces this an excellent school-edition. 4. Oeuvres d'Horace publiées avec une introduction philologique et littéraire et des notes. Frédéric Plessis et Paul Lejay. Paris, 1903. Félix Gaffiot considers this an unusually excellent work. He enumerates some minor details that need correction or improvement. 5. R. Pichon. De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores. Paris, 1902 (Thèse latine). A. Grenier, after giving a brief analysis, says: Il est un instrument précieux, indispensable désormais pour l'étude des oeuvres élégiaques latins. 6. Nonii Marcelli De Compendiosa Doctrina libros XX Oniansianis copiis usus edidit Wallace M. Lindsay, Vol. I and II. Leipzig, 1903. Reviewed at some length by A. Ernout, who describes the work, and highly praises it, but finds a general fault that leads to numerous special ones,—the hesitation of the author to assume a position of his own, or declare a conviction. This defect, however, is quite insignificant. "M. Thewrewk de Ponor had given us a Festus; now we have a

Nonius". 7. The same work, Vol. III, briefly and to the same effect mentioned by the same reviewer. 8. Lactance. *Étude sur le mouvement philosophique et religieux sous le règne de Constantin*, par René Pichon. Paris, 1901. A. Grenier analyzes this work and criticizes it very favorably, but thinks the author treats too briefly the religious theories of Lactantius. The work discusses the authorship of the *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, and decides, against Brandt, that the author was Lactantius. 9. Hildegardis *Causae et Curae*, edidit Paulus Kaiser. Leipzig, 1903. Reviewed by A. Ernout. The work, interesting to Latinists and of importance in the history of medicine, had never been fully published. The reviewer gives a list of about ninety errors, some of which are seemingly typographical, and others equally obvious errors of copyists. 10. Hermann Reich, *Der Mimus, ein litterar-entwickelungsgeschichtlicher Versuch*. Berlin, 1903. Reviewed at considerable length by Ph.-E. Legrand. The two volumes that have appeared are only the first part of a great work, the second part of which is to be published in the near future. The great size of the work (900 pages already) is due to the fact that it is not restricted to the ancient Greek and Roman mime proper, but treats of cognate subjects, and that, too, for all countries and all ages. The portion relating to the mime of ancient Greece and Rome is commended by the reviewer. 11. *Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant, 1810-1817*. The Journal of C. R. Cockerell, R. A. Edited by his son Samuel Pepys Cockerell. London, 1903. B. Haussoullier gives an appreciative analysis, regretting that this interesting journal of the famous archaeologist has been so slow to appear. 12. Paul Cauer, *Palaestra Vitae*. Berlin, 1903. Henri Bornecque finds that this attempt to show that the study of the classics prepares men for practical life, is interesting, but he is not so sure of the soundness of the doctrine though he is himself a Latinist. 13. Franz Skutsch, *Aus Virgils Frühzeit*. Leipzig, 1901. Henri Bornecque, recognizing the ingenuity and the literary merit of this startling attempt to show that Vergil, in the greater part of *Eclogues VI and X*, merely reproduces poems of his friend Cornelius Gallus, rejects the theory as a whole, and finds some special faults. Still he considers the work a very useful one for the study of *Ecl. VI and X* and the *Ciris*. 14. Calpurnius Flaccus, *Declamationes*, edd. G. Lehnert. Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1903. H. B. describes briefly but favorably. The work had been begun by Hugo Dessauer before his death, and his materials were used by the author. 15. A. Gellii, *Noctium Atticarum libri XX post Martinum Herz edidit Carolus Hosius*. Leipzig, 1903. Henri Bornecque pronounces this edition incomparably superior to the one it replaces. 16. *Monumenta Ecclesiae liturgica ediderunt et curaverunt F. Carol, H. Leclercq. Vol. I. Reliquiae liturgiae vetustissimae. Sectio prima*. Paris, 1902. Ch. Michel highly praises this work, which contains all relevant matter in the writ-

ings of the Fathers and in inscriptions down to the time of the Council of Nice.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 169-180. Louis Havet critically discusses and emends seven passages of Plautus.

2. Pp. 181-188. Critical notes on the *Metrica* of Hero, by Paul Tannery. These notes were called forth by the appeal of Hermann Schöne in the introduction to his *Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia*, Vol. III. Leipzig, 1903. About sixty-five passages are corrected. Some of these corrections depend on mathematical principles, such as erroneous limits of the value of π (p. 66, 16 f.) ascribed to Archimedes.

3. Pp. 189-197. Notice of the Greek MS 2832 of the National Library (Paris), by H. Omont. This MS is a collection of six different MSS, copied in the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. A history and description are given, with the text of a few very short poems hitherto unpublished.

4. Pp. 198-201. A. Grenier critically discusses and emends a few passages of Phaedrus.

5. P. 202. B. H. publishes an inscription relating to a lamp race at Didyma, and announces his intention to discuss the subject in the near future.

6. Pp. 203-212. Georges Romain critically discusses and emends ten passages of Plautus.

7. Pp. 213-217. L. Bayard shows that in *Hor. Sat. I. 10. 44*, *molle atque facetum* is in antithesis to *forte* (43) and agrees with *epos*. The article contains an interesting discussion of the uses of *ἔπος* and *epos*.

8. P. 218. Louis Havet discusses *Ter. Ph. 78*.

9. Pp. 219-220. Louis Havet critically discusses *Cic. Orator 153*.

10. Pp. 221-232. Book Notices. 1. *Homerische Paläste. Eine Studie zu den Denkmälern und zum Epos*, von Ferdinand Noack. Leipzig, 1903. Reviewed by W. Dronna. The substance of the review is well summed up in the remark, "Cette étude, d'une lecture parfois pénible, a donc pour résultat de montrer les différences qui existent entre les palais grecs, crétois, et homériques". 2. Three works noticed together by Albert Martin: a) *The Choëphori of Aeschylus*, by T. G. Tucker, Cambridge, 1901; b) *The Knights of Aristophanes*, by R. A. Neil, Cambridge, 1901; c) *Aristophanis Aves*, edidit J. van Leeuwen, Leyden, 1902. The first two, modelled after Jebb's *Sophocles*, are pronounced creditable to English philology. The edition of the *Knights* is posthumous and lacks completion. The edition of the *Birds* is highly commended, but the reflection on

the character of Nicias as having inspired the false charge against Alcibiades in connection with the mutilation of the Hermæ is (very justly) rejected with indignation. 3. Hippocratis opera quæ feruntur omnia, Vol. II. Ex codicibus Italicis edidit Hugo Kühlewein. Leipzig, 1902. Briefly noticed by A. M., who is distrustful of the results of the author's attempt to restore the Ionic forms. 4. Two works: a) Xenophontis Hipparchicus, recensuit P. Cerrocchi, Berlin, 1901; b) Xenophontis de re equestri libellus, recensuit V. Tommasini, Berlin, 1902. A. M. briefly describes these works and concludes: Ces deux éditions, pourvues d'un appareil critique aussi complet qu'il peut l'être aujourd'hui, constituent certainement un progrès très sérieux. 5. Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form von Friedrich Leo. Leipzig, 1901. Albert Martin finds this book very meritorious despite illogical distribution of material. 6. Krause. De Apollodori comicis. Berlin, 1903. Mentioned by Ph. E. Legrand, who regards this doctor-dissertation as proving that there were two Apollodori comici. 7. Historische Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache, herausgegeben von G. Landgraf. Dritter Band. Erstes Heft. Einleitung in die Geschichte der lateinischen Syntax (Golling). Tempora et Modi-Genera Verbi (Blase). Leipzig, 1903. A. Grenier analyzes this work at some length, for the most part favorably, but regrets that the typography is unattractive and confusing. 8. A Latin Grammar by William Gardner Hale and Carl Darling Buck. Boston and London, 1903. J. Lebreton commends this book with considerable warmth, even the parts which he calls a "réforme hardie". 9. Exulum trias, scripsit H. M. R. Leopold, Goudae, 1904. Mentioned by E. Ernout. The triad consists of Cicero, Ovid and Seneca. Though a doctor-dissertation, the work seems to contribute nothing. 10. M. Minucii Felicis Octavius, recensuit Herm. Boenig. Leipzig, 1903. Commended by A. Ernout. 11. Die Tagesgötter in Rom und den Provinzen, von Ernst Maas. Berlin, 1902. Ch. Dubois gives an analysis of this work, which treats thoroughly the whole subject of the seven gods to whom the days of the week belonged. 12. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Iw. v. Müller. —Martin Schanz. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. Vierter Teil: Die römische Litteratur von Constantin bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk Justinians. Erste Hälfte. Die Litteratur des vierten Jahrhunderts. Reviewed by A. Grenier. An analysis is given, with very favorable criticism. 13. A History of Classical Scholarship from the sixth century B. C. to the end of the Middle Ages, by John Edwin Sandys. Cambridge, 1903. A. Ernout praises this work and considers it very useful.

No. 4.

1. Pp. 233-249. À propos of fragments of Philolaos on Music, by Paul Tannery. This article is of very great importance in the history of music, but a précis would be of no value.

2. Pp. 250-255. The elocutionist *Alfius Flavus*, by H. de la Ville de Mirmont. This article is devoted to matters connected with the schools of rhetoric in Rome, especially their influence on Ovid and his influence in turn on the pupils of rhetoric. The date of *Alfius Flavus* is discussed, and his relationship to the praetor of the same name of B. C. 54 is pronounced to be that of grandson or great-grandson, if any at all.

3. P. 255. M. L. Earle calls attention to the relation between *Isocr. Pan.* 149 *τελευτῶντες . . . γεγόνασιν* and *Xen. Anab.* 2. 4. 4 *οὐ γάρ ποτε . . . ἀπῆλθομεν*.

4. Pp. 256-273. Louis Havet critically discusses and emends thirty passages of *Plautus*.

5. Pp. 274-282. *Metrologica*: unpublished fragments of *Florentinus*, by Daniel Serruys. MS 507 of the monastery of *Vatopedi* (Mount Athos) ends with six treatises on Metrology. Serruys describes these, and gives the text of the third one: *Ἐκ τῶν Φλωρεντίνου περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν*, which consists of four extracts. Then he adds an interesting discussion.

6. Pp. 283-292. A new MS of the *Opus Paschale* of *Sedulius*, by Jules Candel. The MS is in the library of Orleans (No. 303). Candel collates it, giving a vast number of variants.

7. P. 292. *Georges Romain* calls attention to the fact that his emendation of *Aulularia* 156 in the preceding number, p. 208, was anticipated by L. Havet fifteen years ago.

8. Pp. 293-303. *Book Notices*. 1. *Collection Raoul Warocqué. Antiquités égyptiennes, grecques et romaines*, Nos. 101-240. *Mariemont*, 1904. B. Haussoullier praises the taste and zeal of the collector, and finds the catalogue excellent, but with a few faults. 2. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* by Carl D. Buck. *Boston*, 1904. A. Grenier highly commends the manner of presenting facts, but regrets that Latin was made the sole basis of comparison. The book does not profess to contribute new facts. 3. H. Bosscher. *De Plauti Curculione disputatio*. *Leyden*, 1903. *Georges Romain*, disapproving the method, finds the work otherwise "one of the most remarkable". Still he adds a long list of details in which he thinks the author is in error. 4. M. Acci *Plauti Amphitruo*. Edidit *Aurelius Josephus Amatucci*. *Bari*, 1903. G. R. finds but one thing to praise: the misprints are comparatively rare. 5. *Plauto. I. Captivi*, col commento di Carlo Pascal. *Seconda edizione. Milano*, 1904. *Georges Romain* considers the commentary excellent but a little prolix. The critical part of the work he does not so heartily approve. The review contains a number of special criticisms. 6. *Carlo Pascal. Sul carme "De ave Phoenix"* attribuito a *Lattanzio*. *Naples*, 1904. *René Pichon* approves the conclusions reached in this pamphlet, for instance, that the poem is not of Christian origin. 7. R. Dedo. *De antiquorum superstitione*

amatoria. Gryphiae, 1904. René Pichon considers this doctor dissertation valuable despite a few doubtful assertions. 8. L. Homo. Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Aurélien. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. 89. Paris, 1904. A. Grenier reviews at considerable length, and considers the work as contributing to our knowledge and at the same time serving as a model of historic research.

The Revue des Revues, begun in a previous number, is completed in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXXI (1902).

Janvier.

A. Thomas. Problèmes étymologiques. 13 pages. The etymologies discussed are those of "caillou" and "trouver".

C. H. Grandgent. Dante and St. Paul. 14 pages. The object of the article is to explain two difficult passages, one in the *Vita Nuova* and one in the *Paradiso*, and, incidentally, to throw some light upon Dante's conception of visions in general and the relation of his own vision to that of St. Paul.

Pio Rajna. L'Episodio delle Questioni d'Amore nel Filocolo del Boccaccio. 54 pages. Prof. Rajna demonstrates that Boccaccio's Decamerone was the evolution of the Questioni d'Amore in his Filocolo. Incidentally it is shown that the Decamerone is due to a mingling of Oriental, Classical and French influences combined by his own powerful imagination.

Lazare Sainéan. Les Éléments orientaux en Roumain III-V. 18 pages. The author has divided his article into: Considérations morphologiques; Considérations sémantiques; Le lexique.

Mélanges. G. Paris, Une Fable à retrouver. Ad. Mussafia, Per un passo del Romanzo Flamenca. A. Delboulle, Fragment d'un mystère du XV^e siècle. A. Delboulle, Loince, linsel, locel, etc. Charles Joret, Huterel. Ov. Densușianu, Roum. îndatîna, datîna. Giacomo de Gregorio, It. (a) bizzeffe. E. Rolland, Dérivés parisiens de mome.

G. Paris. Corrections sur Sone de Nansai. 20 pages. Remarks on the edition of Moritz Goldschmidt.

Comptes rendus. Prof. Dr. Enrico Zaccaria, L'Elemento germanico nella lingua italiana (C. Cipriani). Alfred Pillet, Das Fableau von den Trois Bossus ménestrels und verwandte Erzählungen früher und später Zeit (G. Paris). Marcellin Boudet, Registres consulaires de Saint-Flour en langue romane avec résumé français (P. Meyer).

Périodiques. *Revue des langues romanes*, XLII-XLIII (P. Meyer). *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXV, 5-6 (G. Paris). *Studi di Filologia romanza*, VIII (P. Meyer).

Chronique. Memorial volume for Prof. Dr. Wendelin Förster. Wilhelm Meyer aus Speyer, *Fragmenta Burana*. L. Delisle et P. Meyer, *l'Apocalypse en français*.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 25 titles. The Origin of Rhythmical Verse in Late Latin, by John J. Schlicher. (Dissertation de Chicago: "Le travail de M. Schlicher paraît fait avec beaucoup de réflexion et repose sur un dépouillement consciencieux des faits.") Zur lateinischen und romanischen Metrik, von Prof. Dr. Friedrich Hanssen. A Guide to the Middle English Metrical Romances, by Anna Hunt Billings. ("Ce travail très consciencieusement fait répond à un vrai besoin et sera souvent et utilement consulté.") The Dialogues of Gregory the Great, by Timothy Cloran.

Avril et Juillet.

J. Leite de Vasconcellos. *Canção de Sancta Fides de Agen*: texto provençal. 24 pages. Editio princeps from a manuscript in the University Library at Leiden.

E. Philipon. *Les Accusatifs en -on et en -ain*. 51 pages. Discussion of a Germanic or a Latin origin, the question being decided in favor of the latter. G. Paris accepts this view in a foot-note.

P. Meyer. *La Vie et la translation de Saint Jacques le Majeur*: Mise en prose d'un poème perdu. 22 pages. Publication of a Latin and a French text.

C. Salvioni. *Etimologie*. 22 pages. Discussion of forty etymologies.

J. A. Candréa-Hecht. *Étymologies roumaines*. 19 pages. Discussion of twenty-seven etymologies.

A. Piaget. *La Belle Dame sans merci et ses imitations*: IV. *La Cruelle femme en amour d'Achille Caulier*. Critical edition of the text from three manuscripts.

A. Delboulle. *Mots obscurs et rares de l'ancienne langue française*. 26 pages. This is the first instalment of a long lexicological study based on a wide reading in Old French literature.

Mélanges. P. Meyer, *Satire en vers rythmiques sur la Légende de Saint Brendan*. P. Meyer, *Poème en quatrains sur la Pécheresse de l'Évangile*. A. Mussafia, *Flamenca* 2761 sgg. Fr. Wulff, *Les premières ébauches de Pétrarque après le 19 mai 1348*. A. Delboulle, *Caule et ses dérivés*. A. Delboulle, *Crane*. A. Thomas, *Ancien franç. Fauterne*. J. Loth, *Ganelon et le breton Ganas*.

Comptes rendus. W. Meyer-Lübke, Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft (Mario Roques). W. Förster und E. Koschwitz, Altfranzösisches Uebungsbuch (P. Meyer). M. Enneccerus, Versbau und gesanglicher Vortrag des ältesten französischen Liedes (Al. François). A. Marignan, La Tapisserie de Bayeux (G. Paris). W. Förster, Kristian von Troyes "Cligés" (J. Mettrop). G. Gröber, Altfranzösische Glossen (Am. Salmon). Karl Kemna, Der Begriff "Schiff" im Französischen (A. Thomas). Charlotte-J. Cipriani, Étude sur quelques noms propres d'origine germanique (A. Thomas). U. Lindelöf et A. Wallensköld, Les Chansons de Gautier d'Épinal (A. Jeanroy). G. Steffens, Der kritische Text der Gedichte von Richart de Semilli (A. Jeanroy). Uppsatser i romansk filologi tillägnade Prof. P. A. Geijer (G. Paris).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXVI 1-3 discussion of etymologies (G. Paris). Archivio glottologico italiano, XV 3 e suppl. VII, discussion of etymologies (M. Roques). Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, XXII (E. M.). Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, XXII-XXIII (A. Jeanroy). Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français, 1901.

Chronique. Obituary notices on Wilhelm Hertz, Charles Potvin and Lorédan Larchey. Account of Prof. Gröber's Grundriss der romanischen Philologie, which was completed in 1902.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 19 titles. Roger Grand, Les plus anciens textes romans de la Haute-Auvergne. Dr. Carl Voretzsch, Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Sprache. Karl Kneuer. Die Sprichwörter Hendyngs. Alberto Zenatti, Il trionfo d'Amore.

Octobre.

A. Thomas. Les Substantifs abstraits en -ier et le suffixe -arius. 18 pages. Discussion of a number of theories which have been advanced within the last half-century.

C. Nigra. Notes étymologiques et lexicales. 28 pages. Discussion of eight groups of etymologies, chiefly Italian.

Gaston Raynaud. Un nouveau manuscrit du Petit Jean de Saintré. 30 pages. Discussion of the contents and value of the nine manuscripts known to be extant, and more especially of that of a manuscript recently acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris.

Lazare Sainéan. Les Éléments orientaux en Roumain. 33 pages. The following classes of words are distinguished: Emprunts osmanlis communs; Emprunts isolés (Emprunts valaques; Emprunts moldaves).

Mélanges. P. E. Guarnerio, Particella pronominali sarde. A. Thomas, Anc. franç. Gers. A. Thomas, Anc. franc. Moule de

frument. Anton Wallner, Sur le poème latin des Misères de la vie humaine. P. Meyer, Un nouveau texte de la pièce Flors de Paradis. Arthur Piaget, Un manuscrit de la Cour amoureuse de Charles VI.

Comptes rendus. A Ernesto Monaci: Scritti vari di filologia (G. Paris). Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie: Festgabe für Wendelin Foerster (G. Paris). A. Pillet, Studien zur Pastourelle (A. Jeanroy). G. Thureau, Der Refrain in der französischen Chanson (A. Jeanroy).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXVI 4, discussion of etymologies (G. Paris). Romanische Forschungen, XI-XIII (G. Paris). Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie III-IV (G. Paris).

Chronique. A professorship of Romance Philology has recently been created at Bucarest. E. Löseth's study of the British Museum manuscripts of the prose Tristan.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 25 titles. Kate Oelzner Petersen, The Sources of the Parson's Tale ("Miss Petersen, dont nous avons apprécié naguère le remarquable travail sur un autre conte de Chaucer, a soumis le Parson's Tale à une patiente et méthodique investigation"). Paget Toynbee, Dante Studies and Researches ("Il est inutile d'insister sur la valeur de ces travaux, par lesquels l'auteur s'est rapidement acquis une haute position entre les connaisseurs de Dante"). Paget Toynbee, Dante Alighieri ("La plus grande partie de cet agréable livre est consacrée à la vie de Dante").

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

BRIEF MENTION.

Professor EARLE has displayed in his edition of the *Medea* (American Book Company) the same nice knowledge of Greek idiom and the same faculty of neat statement that made his *Oedipus* something out of the common run of college text-books and brought it within the range of the Journal (A. J. P. XXII 227). This nice knowledge of Greek has bred in him, as it is wont to do, fastidiousness as to the tradition, and for some years Professor EARLE has occupied an almost solitary eminence among American Hellenists as a conjectural critic; and so we find that in his edition of the *Medea*, he has incorporated into the text a considerable number of conjectures of his own. These alone would attract the attention of Professor EARLE's 'peers' to whom he appeals in his preface. The trouble about such an appeal is the constitution of the jury and the right of unlimited challenge that resides in the appellant. The other characteristic of Professor EARLE's book—the diligent pursuit of the phenomena of diction and syntax—will commend his notes to those who are studying Greek by themselves and need the guidance of an experienced teacher. The ordinary drill-master, on the other hand, will be somewhat resentful of the magisterial way, in which Professor EARLE has anticipated the usual questions of the classroom. Nor will the references to the current grammars satisfy the partisans of those manuals and I, for one, am sorry to see so pretty a book disfigured by strings of letters which have been inserted in obedience to commercial exigencies, and, I fear, all in vain. If all the grammars are not cited, then the questions will arise: Who maketh G to differ? Who maketh HA to differ? Why cite GS when G or HA will suffice? Why make any note at all, when such and such a grammar is at hand? My own example as a text-book maker has not been such a shining success that I can venture to give advice, but in the only Greek authors that I have edited, I have deliberately cut loose from all references, and have taken the ground that if a thing is worthy of notice, it is worthy of succinct statement. If there are to be references, let them be made, as they are in some editions, to a grammatical synopsis in the book itself.

In running over the notes, I have noticed some little *ludi magister* matters, in which it seems to me that Professor EARLE's persistency in making points, his didacticism, so to speak, has

been a snare to him. So, for instance, 'v. 33: ἀτιμάσας ἔχει = ἡτίμακε. This analytical perfect is noticeably common in Sophocles. In such a verb as ἴσσημι, it is the only possible form for the transitive perf. act.' Here we have either too much or too little. Why Sophokles and not Aischylos, who according to Dindorf has but one example? If ἴσσημι is to be mentioned, why not the lack of perfect forms elsewhere? Why not cite v. 90 as an example of the indispensableness of the analytical perfect? But when we come to v. 90, we are told oracularly that 'ἐρημώσας ἔχε is more than ἡρήμωκε', as if the 2 p. perf. imper. act. had anything but a death-in-life existence in the paradigms. V. 65, σίθεν for σου 'is one of the archaisms affected by Euripides. Incidentally it serves admirably to fill out the line'. Mommsen's remark on σίθεν is worth recording but the latter part of the note implies that this is a metrical trick of Euripides, and if this half-sneer at the poet is justified, we should expect a similar note on πρὸς = ὑπό, an equation which Professor EARLE makes repeatedly in his commentary. πρὸς is commended metrically quite as much as σίθεν. It avoids hiatus before ὑπ'. It avoids the lilt of ὑπό, the same lilt that has banished ἀποθανεῖν from tragedy in favour of καταθανεῖν. V. 95, 'μὴ φίλους is, strictly speaking, redundant after ἐχθρούς'. The negative statement is not a redundancy but a reinforcement. See Professor EARLE's own note on v. 36, repeated v. 276. V. 310: ὅπως ἦγεν: 'according to the promptings of your heart'. 'The imperfect in ἦγεν marks the persistence of the emotion that led to the action described in the aorist ἐξέδου', just as ἔως with the aorist is regularly preceded by the imperfect. But in the present form, the note seems to me utterly otiose. Professor EARLE's translation suggests the lesson, ἦγεν 'promptings', ἦγαγεν 'prompting', the imperfect representing the plural. Three barleycorns make one inch, three stars, say the rabbis, make one night, three aorists make one imperfect. And then there is the *pluralis maiestatis*, ἐκέλευεν, 'gave orders', not 'order'. The imperfect ἦγε is often used, where some critics write ἦγαγεν quite unnecessarily. So ἀγειν where some people expect ἀγαγεῖν. V. 316, 'In these two verses, we have a variant of the familiar contrast overworked by Thucydides, though a commonplace of Greek style, between λόγος "fiction" and ἔργον "fact". Of course, the polarity of 'word' and 'deed' is as old as 'word' and 'deed', and it is not necessary to cite Kemmer (A. J. P. XXIV 361) to prove it. But the polarity of λόγος, practically a post-Homeric word, and ἔργον belongs to the rationalistic movement of the fifth century and if Thucydides overworked it, he overworked a comparatively new toy, as some people overwork Greek syntax. He overworked it as he overworked the articular infinitive, as he overworked the substantivized adjective and participle, and Professor EARLE's note on Med. 178: τό γ' ἐμὸν πρόθυμον, quickens my regret that I did not select better examples (S. C. G. p. 16) to show the affinity of Thucydides and Euripides in this regard. Much more striking than Med. 178 are Hec. 299: τῷ θυμουμένῳ,

Hipp. 248: τὸ μαινόμενον and I. A. 1270: τὸ κείνου βουλόμενον. V. 474: It is hardly correct to say that λυπήσῃ is the Attic form for both continuative (imperfect) and aorist future passive. 'Cobet's authority has been shaken by the testimony of the stones', as Mr. Wyse points out in his *Isaeus*, p. 207. V. 597: ἔρυμα δώμασιν: 'with the same cadence as in *Bacch.* 55: ἀλλ' ὃ λιπούσαι Τρωῶλον, ἔρυμα Λυδίας. The dative of interest in this passage might have been a genitive'. But the two passages are typically different. ἔρυμα Λυδίας, is a mere definition. ἔρυμα δώμασιν shows a present practical interest. A pretty example of the shift is Andokid. 1, 117: ἦν θεῖός μοι, ἀδελφὸς τῆς μητρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς. V. 718: τοιάδ' οἶδα φάρμακα: 'this form of expression, native to English as to Greek, is logically a reversal of the order of cause and effect. Logical would be τοιάδε δ' οἶδα φάρμακα ὥστε παύσω σ' ὄντ' ἄπαιδα'. A remark of this sort is positively hurtful, unless it is accompanied by the statement that the 'logical' form of expression is a stranger to Greek, so far as we know, down to a comparatively late time. The absence of the consecutive construction is one of the most striking features of Homeric syntax and the conception is not to be thrust into poetry.

But Professor EARLE will say: Relinque aliquantum orationis cras quod mecum litiges, and I turn to the feature of his edition first mentioned—his conjectures,—though all that I have to say of them is that they recall to my mind, by way of contrast, the brief note of WEIL in his new edition of the *Hippolytus*. 'Ces changements', he says, in recording the variations from his previous texts, 'ces changements—sont pour la plupart des retours au texte des manuscrits'. Perhaps when Professor EARLE reaches the age of the great Hellenist, whom we both admire, the *n*th edition of the *Medea* may contain a similar remark. The fact is that though I was trained by scholars who were far from averse to conjectural criticism, the hosts of extemporaneous restorations, or, as a good friend of mine would call them, 'autoschediastic repristinations', such as are poured forth by the veteran Blaydes and other scholars, have bewildered me so that I have settled down glumly to making the best of tradition; and I feel sorry for the future editor of the *Odyssey*, who will doubtless regard it his duty to register all the corrections that Mr. AGAR has set forth in the latest number of the *Journal of Philology*. They take up no less than fifty pages out of 128; and I hope that I shall be forgiven for prizing above all this critical acumen and creative ingenuity the few pages Mr. CECIL BENDALL occupies with his notes on the pronunciation of Greek as deduced from Graeco-Indian Bilingual Coins, B. C. 180-20. But instead of making any further confession of my own weakness in regard to conjectural criticism, I yield the floor of *Brief Mention* for a space to Mr. KENYON, whose words on this subject will carry more weight than mine.

The earlier the MS, the better, is a critical canon that was rudely shaken by the discovery of ancient papyri (cf. A. J. P. VI 109, XIII 383), and Dr. Kenyon's paper on the *Evidence of Greek Papyri with regard to Textual Criticism*, read January 27, 1904, before the British Academy is thoroughly disillusioning. 'The earliest papyri', he says, 'in spite of their difference in character from their successors, do not materially affect our conclusion as to the authenticity of our generally received texts'. 'Some errors are shown to be of earlier origin even than our papyri; and where the papyri do help us, they so rarely (on the whole) confirm the conjectures which critics have proposed as to make us doubt the power of modern scholarship without their aid'. 'It cannot be denied that in general the papyri do not support the conjectures of modern scholars. When they do, the variations have been generally small; in no case, it may safely be said, has any sweeping change been justified by the papyri'. 'Of the two aids upon which textual criticism is wont to rely in dealing with a doubtful text, the acumen of the critic and the scientific handling of the documentary evidence, the former is shown to be of very limited value. The chances against successful divination are great; and even if a critic should chance to be right, it is hardly possible to demonstrate his success. Consequently the presumption will always be against any emendation (except the simpler corrections of a newly discovered text) until documentary evidence can be produced in its support. But when documentary evidence is producible, then critical scholarship has its proper function to decide between the alternatives offered and often to prefer the evidence of a single witness to that of a considerable number. But even here the papyri have weakened its resources'. 'The papyri have shown us decisively in some cases, and allow us to argue by analogy to others, that <the> family-divisions <of MSS> are of relatively late origin, and that the better MSS have no sort of monopoly of ancient and correct readings'. 'In future, the editor will have to be prepared to find the truth not unfrequently among the witnesses who are usually inferior, and to exercise a freer judgment in deciding between them'. These are sweeping sentences and must call forth, if they have not already called forth, very active gain-saying on the part of those who are endowed with a quickness of vision and a readiness of resource that are denied to the pedestrian members of the philological guild, the ἀπτήνες ἐφημέριοι ταλαὶ βροτοὶ on whom the Immortal Birds look down with undisguised contempt. And yet one is tempted to see in recent critical work some signs of the liberty regained, of which Dr. KENYON speaks, and wider eclecticism is beginning to make itself felt. At all events, Mr. Wyse's aphorism (Isaeus p. 336) will hardly apply to Mr. KENYON. 'The most tenacious upholders of MS authority are generally people who have not studied MSS'.

The fact that my own style has been pronounced 'bad' by the *Saturday Review* and 'unscholarly' by the *Spectator* has not in any way dampened my ardor in the study of the elements of literary composition. If the sentence is just, I am no worse off than the great majority of the guild to which I belong; and time brings with it many consolations. Gildersleeve's Pindar, said a superfine critic, nearly twenty years ago, 'is not a Pindaric book', but since the ancient date of that criticism, I have read some judgments on Pindar that might cause Mr. VERRALL to change his opinion. WILAMOWITZ says of Pindar 'Der adelsstolze Aegide schrickt nicht vor dem hässlichen zurück'. SCHROEDER remarks 'Geben wir uns doch keinen Illusionen hin. Gerade im Gebrauch der Metaphern ist Pindars Kunst noch roh und ungeläutert'. But the characteristic of all characteristics is the one that I owe to the kindness of a friend, who has sent me the following extract from J. HART'S *Geschichte der Weltliteratur* (I 247): In seinen Adern rollt das schwere Blut des Böotiers und wie ein Mastodont stampft dieser Dichter durch die Haine der hellenischen Dichtung denn auch dahin, schwer und wuchtig'. So perhaps my book is a Pindaric book after all.

Since which things are so, undismayed I continue to study the old rusty canons of style and to treasure the *obiter dicta* of critics, far inferior to the one I am about to cite. In an essay written shortly before his lamented death KARL HILLEBRAND made an observation which left so deep an impression on my mind that I can hardly be wrong as to the substance of it, though I have not been able to verify the passage itself. Every cultivated Englishman, he wrote in effect, reads French, but how many can distinguish between French styles? How many can measure the distance that separates Prosper Mérimée and Octave Feuillet? Now this is a home-thrust at the mob of people who read French as they do English, but there are not so many, even of those born to the English tongue who could give any reasoned account of the difference between the most strongly contrasted English styles. And when it comes to comparing national styles, French style as a whole with English style as a whole, the most determined analyst might well give it up in despair. But we Americans are a very resolute set and in the preface to his translation of CROISSET'S *Abridged History of Greek Literature* (Macmillan), Professor HEFFELBOWER does not hesitate to give us the conclusion of the whole matter in a few pregnant words. 'The innate quality of dignified French style', he says, 'is brilliance; while that of even the most polished English style is majesty'. And, what is more, he has undertaken to live up to his canon. The brilliance of the CROISSETS is to be the majesty of HEFFELBOWER. Of course, my curiosity, as a student of style, was piqued by this confession of faith and profession of practice and I read eagerly

page after page, finding, to my intense disappointment that the English suggested everywhere a retranslation into French. If the experiment had been a success, this would have been impossible. In the first place the periodology seemed to be French throughout and the particles betrayed the translator; and I could not suppress the question: 'If these things are done in CROISSET, what would have been done in the Goncourts, who boasted that they were untranslatable?' But I am a timid soul and distrust impressionistic criticism. So I began to compare the HEFFELBOWER rendering with the original, and turned to the page devoted to Hipponax for closer study. Hipponax belongs to the tramp class, for which we all have a weakness in literature, and I thought that p. 110 would give a good opportunity to compare the brilliance of Paris with the majesty of Waukesha. The disillusionment was great. Everybody knows that Hipponax was a little, scrawny, misshapen fellow and ALFRED CROISSET says of him, 'Il était, dit-on, petit et contrefait'. The brilliance of this sentence, I confess, it is hard to discern, but still harder the majesty of HEFFELBOWER's rendering—'Men said he was petty and counterfeit'.

Now this blunder is so preposterous that at first I doubted whether it could be matched in the 562 pp. of Professor HEFFELBOWER's version. But I am genuinely sorry to say that it is not a solitary slip but only a majestic specimen. For I yield to no one in my admiration of the CROISETS, and I had hoped that we should have a brief history of Greek literature that should be neither dry nor deliquescent nor frivolous (A. J. P. XXV 234), and if it cannot be had in English and cannot be illustrated by English literature, a good translation from such French masters as the CROISETS would serve an excellent purpose. But my hopes are dashed. True, the translator in his Preface thanks the authors for the reading of the manuscript before it went to press. But we all know what that amounts to. The *Athenaeum* of Oct. 29 says that 'Mr. Heffebower has done his part of the work well'. But reviewers learn to distrust reviewers. The *Nation* of January 12 points out some sad mistakes in the translation of the specimens of Greek literature, the rare specimens selected by the Croisets for the illustration of the text, but the false translations and poor translations are not confined to these parts of the book. 'The translation is fluent enough', says the *Nation*, and so it is. And that is the worst of it, or to quote Rudyard Kipling, in 'The Old Men', 'and that is the hell of it'. I open the book at Chapter XV on Aristophanes. 'Enfant de génie' is rendered 'talented youth'. 'Enfant de génie' may be 'brilliant' and 'talented youth' 'majestic', and, though I have not forgotten Coleridge's disapproval of 'talented', I forbear. But what is this? 'Already

(*déjà, schon*) a moralist and a sharp critic of the new tendencies, he followed the fashion of the day in making his plays educational'. Now there is a strong didactic tendency in all Greek comedy as in all Greek literature, and though every Greek scholar knows that the *Δαιταλῆς* was a forerunner of the *Clouds* in its assaults on the education of the day, the sentence might pass. But what says M. MAURICE CROISET, for it is Maurice and not Alfred that speaks this time—a fact we should never have learned from the translator? 'Déjà moraliste et critique acerbe des tendances nouvelles il y faisait le procès de l'éducation à la mode'. Even if Professor HEFFELBOWER had known less French than he seems to know, an elementary knowledge of Greek literature would have saved him here as it would have saved him in the passage about Hipponax. I turn to the section on Isokrates (p. 361) by ALFRED CROISET. 'Isokrates', we are told, 'completed his education under Gorgias, then retired to Thessaly, and returned to Athens to practice the profession of a logographer'. The original shows that it was Gorgias who had retired to Thessaly and not Isokrates. 'Questions of inheritance, fraud, *injustice*, seemed paltry to him'. A question of injustice is never paltry, not even when it pertains to translations from the French. But the original has 'injures', and everyone who has read Lysias catches the allusion to Lys. VIII κατηγορία πρὸς τοὺς συνουσιαστὰς κακολογιῶν. 'What has given <Isokrates> the considerable place he holds in the history of Greek prose is his *declamatory orations and his discourses of instruction*', gives us a false and misleading version of 'ses discours d'apparat et son enseignement'. But this is small game for a philological journal, and Professor HEFFELBOWER might have escaped *Brief Mention*, if it had not been for the daring generalization of his preface and the bold assertion of his own ideal. Doubtless he has learned much from close communion with such admirable scholars as the CROISETS who are singular in their ability to translate grammatical and linguistic phenomena into literary characteristic, just as Mrs. CUST (A. J. P. XXI 476) must have learned a great deal about semantics from her rendering of BRÉAL's *Sémantique*, which, by the way, has reached its third edition, but it is little short of a crime for any one but an accomplished Greek scholar to meddle with such a work of art as CROISET. The abridged CROISET is 'not a work of erudition' says the author's preface, but it is based on erudition. To understand CROISET one must know the subject at first hand. Gibbon was translated by Guizot, Karl Otfried Müller by Karl Hillebrand, and the CROISETS deserved a better fate.

M. BRÉAL has warned us against personification (XVIII 368). Yet given *la langue* and *le langage*, who would not choose *la langue*? Language is a woman, a queen, a coquette, with all the audacities, all the pudencies of the sex; now outspoken,

now reticent; now *décolletée*, now *collet monté*; one thing in the street, another in the ball-room, yet another in the water. Every student of language notices these things. Language is perfectly capable of murdering a child and putting flowers on its grave. The English dative has been killed. Its inheritance has been given to the accusative and yet when it comes to turning the dead dative into a nominative along with the accusative there is a certain recalcitrancy, as English grammarians have noticed (A. J. P. XXIII 18). 'I was read a letter' hurts. Promote a drudge to be a noble (A. J. P. XXIII 11). Elevate the articular infinitive. Give it the *σεμνότης* of a verbal noun. But mark! it is a 'persönlicher Adel' such as is bestowed on professors in Germany. It has no plural. It must after all make its obeisance to the verbal noun. French has no scruples—*les devoirs*, *les pouvoirs*. Of course, there is no way of making a plural to the infinitive in Greek or in Latin, but the language ought to have thought of that before. These limitations in the use of the infinitive are very interesting as showing a subconsciousness of language, or of the users of language, if you choose. In my note on Persius 1, 9: *nostrum id vivere triste* I said, 'This is a so-called *figura Graeca* which out-Greeks the Greeks. *Scire tuum* v. 27; *ridere meum* v. 122; *velle suum* 5, 53; *sapere nostrum* 6, 38 cannot be rendered literally into the language from which they are supposed to be imitated'. This was in 1875 before anybody paid any attention to American work in grammar and the challenge was not noticed. I came back to the subject in my article on the articular infinitive (*Transactions Am. Phil. Ass.* 1878, p. 3): In classic Greek there is no parallel for certain Latin constructions, such as are usually set down as Hellenisms. In such Greek as that of Ignatius we are not surprised to find, Ep. ad Eph. 3: τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν 11: τὸ ἀλήθινον ζῆν, ad Magn. 1: τοῦ διὰ παντὸς ἡμῶν ζῆν; 5: τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ, all vulgarisms or Latinisms. But the traditional view persists, and in an elaborate article on the Latin substantivized infinitive (cf. A. J. P. VIII 103) Wölfflin speaks of Greek influence, as does Brenous (A. J. P. XVII 520). In an Upsala dissertation of 1893 Nordenstam, who has made use of my work, brushes my remark aside and cites passages from Plotinus, as if Plotinus counted among the classic Greek authors. And even Plotinus has not the hardihood to put the possessive genitive between the article and the infinitive except once, as Nordenstam himself notes. Now it seems to me passing strange that there should not be a solitary survival of τὸ ἡμέτερον ζῆν in the whole range of classical Greek literature and that the only way in which it has come down to us is through the Latin reproduction of it. In his notes on Schepers' edition of Alkiphron, Rh. M. LVIII 454, Bücheler postulates the Greek construction, writes I 9, 3: ἐπὶ τῷ σφετέρῳ κερδαίνειν, translates Plautus's, *tuum amare* (Curc. 28) τὸ σὸν ἐρᾶν and makes merry over the commentators of fifty years syne, who would not accept the reading of the MSS in X. Anab. VII 7. 24 ἄλλων τὸ ἤδη κολάζειν—an impossible con-

struction, said the old duffers, who cited the other old duffers, Matthiä and Rost. But Matthiä had read more Greek than most Greek grammarians and Rost was a man of excellent sense and while Krüger has shown conclusively (§ 47 10, 2) that the articular infinitive can take the genitive, every example cited by him has the genitive outside of the complex and the example that he adduces from Herodotos IX 58, 2: 'Ἀρταβάζου δὲ θῶμα καὶ μᾶλλον ἐποιεῦμην τὸ καὶ καταρρωδῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίους, is not a possessive genitive unless we choose to call *θαυμάζω τί τινος* an instance of a possessive genitive. It is not the possessive genitive, strictly speaking. Kühner-Gerth (II 2, 37) calls it the subjective genitive but the possessive genitive may be subjective as well; and nearly all the examples are clearly partitive as is the genitive with parts of the body and if the personification we call language is too dainty to put the genitive between the article and the infinitive, it was too dainty to combine the possessive pronoun with the articular infinitive. In the absence of further evidence, then, *nostrum vivere* is vulgar Latin or at most pseudo-Greek, like some of the French phrases that have to be interpreted to a Frenchman.

G. L. H.: In his edition of *du Bellay's La Deffence et illustration de la langue francoyse* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1904) M. HENRI CHAMARD has given us a fitting complement to his very meritorious doctorate thesis upon the author, published in 1900. It is bound to be cited as the standard edition, as it gives an exact reproduction of the original edition of 1549 without the inaccuracies found in Person's edition, hitherto considered the best. The student of the French language owes the editor a debt of gratitude for the variants of all the editions of the sixteenth century, which are to be found in the critical apparatus. In the notes the editor has been the first to point out the sources of a number of passages in the treatise, and the illustrative citations from contemporary writers show a wide acquaintance with the literature of the period. Further, the notes upon points of philological matter have a merit, found in very few editions of French works of the sixteenth century.

Professor HERBERT A. STRONG, Liverpool University, is engaged in translating Müller and Deecke's *Etrusker*. The latest discovered inscriptions in the Etruscan language will be given.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 11 E. 17th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Ashmore (Sidney G.) The classics and modern training. New York, *Putnam*, 1905. 6+159 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.25 net.

Bennett (C. E.) Preparatory Latin writer. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1905, 202 pp. 12°, cl., 80 cts.

Butcher (S. H.) Harvard lectures on Greek subjects. New York, *Macmillan*, 1904. 8+266 pp. 12°, cl., \$2.25 net.

Chadwick, (H. M.) Studies on Anglo-Saxon institutions. New York, *Macmillan*, 1905. 13+422 pp. 12°, cl., \$2.50.

Dionysius Alexandrinus. Ed. by C. Zett Feltoe; with Greek text and English notes. New York, *Macmillan*, 1904. 35+283 pp. 8°, \$2.25 net.

Flickinger (R. C.) Plutarch as a source of information on the Greek theater. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1904. 56 pp. 8°, pap., 75 cts. net.

Isaeus, The speeches of. With critical and explanatory notes by W. Wyse. New York, *Macmillan*, 1905. 74+735 pp. 8°, cl., \$6 net.

Maimonides (Moses). The guide for the perplexed; from the original text by M. Friedländer. New York, *Dutton*, 1905. 8°, cl., \$3 net.

Merrill (W. A.) Latin hymns. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1904. c. 13+86 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.

Paschal (G. W.) A study of Quintus of Smyrna. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1904. 82 pp. 12°, cl., 75 cts. net.

Richmond (H. J.) The pronunciation of Greek and Latin proper names in English. Ann Arbor, Michigan, *G. Wahr*, 1905. 56+6 pp. 12°, cl., 30 cts.

Van Buren (J. H.) Latin hymns in English verse. Boston, *Old Corner Book Store*, 1904. 17+175 pp. pls., 12°, cl., \$1.25 net.

Virgil. Aeneid. Bks. 1-6 by C. E. Bennett. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1904. 30+461 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.20.

Whibley (Leonard.) A companion to Greek studies. New York, *Macmillan*, 1905. 30+672 pp. il. maps, 8°, cl., \$6 net.

ENGLISH.

Johns (C. H. W.) Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, Letters. London, 1904. 446 pp. 8°, 12s.

King (L. W.) Records of the Reign of Tukulti-Ninib I, King of Assyria, about B. C. 1275. London, 1904. 8°, 6s.

Wollaston (A. N.) English-Persian Dictionary. London, 1904. 478 pp. 8°, 21s.

FRENCH.

Boissier (A.) Choix de textes relatifs à la divination assyro-babylonienne. *Genf*, 1905. 8°, 25 fr.

Brunot (F.) Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900. T. I. De l'époque latine à la Renaissance, in 8°, *Librairie A. Colin*. 15 fr.

Cousin (G.) De urbibus quarum nominibus vocabulum ΠΟΛΙΣ finem faciebat, in 8°, 1 vol. *Berger-Levrault et C^{ie}*. 7 fr. 50.

Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes, T. III, Syria, Palestina, Arabia, in 8°, 1 vol. *E. Leroux*. 2 fr. 50.

GERMAN.

- Ahlberg (Axel W.) *Studia de accentu latino*. (69 S.) 8. Lund, (H. Möller) 1905. m. 2.25.
- Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis. III. ed. Frider. Blass. (lxxx, 207 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 2.40; geb. m. 2.90.
- Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, begründet v. C. W. M. Grein. Fortges. v. R. P. Wülker. 8. Hamburg, *H. Grand*. 6. Bd. Denkmäler, kleinere angelsächsische. Hrsg. v. Günth. Leonhardi. (v, 243 S.) 1905. m. 10.
- Borghorst (G.) *De Anatolii fontibus*. Diss. (68 S.) 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1904. m. 1.60.
- Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum. Lex. 8. Bruxelles, *H. Lamertin*. V. Codicum romanorum partem I descripserunt Francisc. Cumont et Francisc. Boll. (viii, 256 S.) 1904. m. 8.
- Chronicon civile et ecclesiasticum anonymi auctoris. Ed. Ignatius Ephraem II Rahmani. (In syr. Sprache.) (vii, 152 S.) 8. Beirut, 1904. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. m. 10.
- Christensen (Arth.) *Recherches sur les Rubā'iyāt de 'Omar Hayyām*. (iii, 174 S.) Heidelberg, *C. Winter*, 1905. m. 9.
- Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. 40, 5×29, 5 cm. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. Vol. XIII, partis II fasc. I. Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum latinae. Edd. O. Hirschfeld et C. Zangemeister. Partis 2 fasc. I. Inscriptiones Germaniae superioris. Ed. C. Zangemeister. (v, 30 u. 503 S.) 1905. m. 60.
- Ephemeris epigraphica, corporis inscriptionum latinarum supplementum, edita iussu instituti archaeologici Romani. Vol. IX. Fasc. 2. (v, u. 187-332 S.) 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1905. m. 8.
- Gatha's, die, des Awesta. Zarathushtra's Verspredigten, übers. v. C. Bartholomae. (x, 133 S.) 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1905. m. 3.
- Georgii Monachi chronicon ed. Carol. de Boor. Vol. II. (lxxxiv, u. 383-804 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 10.
- Gross (Adf.) *Die Stichomythie in der griechischen Tragödie u. Komödie*. (108 S.) 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1905. m. 2.80.
- Neue (Frdr.) *Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache*. 4. Bd. Register m. Zusätzen u. Verbesserungn. 3 Aufl. v. C. Wagener. (397 S.) 8. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*, 1905. m. 16.
- Plauti (T. Macci) comoediae ex recensione G. Goetz et F. Schoell. Fasc. II. Bacchides, Captivos, Casinam complectens. Ed. II emendatior. (xviii, 161 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 1.50.
- Preuss (Sieg.) *Index Isocrateus*. (iv, 112 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 8.
- Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum commentaria. Ed. E. Diehl. II. (vi, 334 S.) 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. m. 8.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Hrsg. v. H. Collitz u. F. Bechtel. III. Bd. 2. Hälfte. 4. Heft. 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. III, 2, IV. Hoffmann (O.) *Die sicilischen Inschriften u. die Söldnerinschriften v. Abu-Simbel*. (225-289 S.) 1904. m. 2.20.
- Sammlung indogermanischer Lehrbücher. Hrsg. v. Herm. Hirt. I. Reihe: Grammatiken. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter Verl.* 1. Bd. Thumb, Alb.: *Handbuch des Sanskrit m. Texten u. Glossar*. 1. Tl.: Grammatik. (xviii, 505 S.) 1905. m. 14.
- Sommer (Ferd.) *Griechische Lautstudien*. (vii, 172 S.) 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1905. m. 5.
- Studia syriaca*. Primo Publ. Ignat. Ephraem II Rahmani. (iv, u. 72-55 S.) 8. Beirut, 1904. (Rom, *Loescher & Co.*) m. 8.
- Walde (A.) *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. (In etwa 10 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. (1-80 S.) 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter Verl.*, 1905. Subskr. Pr. m. 1.50.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

'Αθηνά. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος δέκατος ἕκτος. Τεύχος τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον. 'Αθήνησιν, 1904.

Belles-Lettres Series: Gospel of Saint Matthew in West Saxon. Ed. from the MSS. By James Wilson Bright. 40 c. Gospel of Saint John in West Saxon. Ed. from the MSS, with Introduction and Notes. By James Wilson Bright. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.* 60 c.

Brandon (E. E.) Robert Estienne et le Dictionnaire Français au XV^e Siècle. Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris pour le Doctorat d'Université. Baltimore, *J. H. Furst Co.*, 1904.

Biese (Alfred). Römische Elegiker (Catull, Tibull, Propert, Ovid). 2te verb. u. verm. Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1905. geb. 1 m. 20 pf.

British School at Rome. Vol. II. Sixteenth-Century Drawings of Roman Buildings, attributed to Andreas Coner. By T. Ashby, Jr. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1904.

Burton. (Ernest De Witt). Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem. University of Chicago. Decennial Publications. Chicago, 1904. \$1.

Cagnat. Cours d'Épigraphie Latine. Supplément à la troisième édition. Paris, *Fontemoing*, 1894.

Cicéron, Oeuvres de. De Oratore Liber Primus. Texte Latin avec un Commentaire critique et explicatif. Par Edmond Courbaud. Paris, *Hachette et C^{ie}*.

Ciceros Rede über den Oberbefehl des Pompeius. Für d. Schulgebr. herausg. von Hermann Nohl. 3. Auflage. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1905. 60 pf.

Ellis (Robinson). Catullus in the XIVth Century. By Robinson Ellis. London, *Henry Frowde*, 1905. 1s. net.

Demosthène. Discours Judiciaires. Traduction entièrement nouvelle, avec arguments et notes. Par C. Poyard. Paris, *Garnier Frères*, 1905.

Fossler (Laurence). Material for Practical German Conversation. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1904.

Geffcken (Johannes). Das griechische Drama: Aischylos, Sophokles, Euripides. Mit e. Plan des Theaters des Dionysos zu Athen. Leipzig u. Berlin, *Theodor Hoffmann*, 1904. 2 m. 20 pf.

Goethe, Wolfgang von. Götz von Berlichingen. Herausg. v. G. Frick. Leipzig u. Berlin, *Teubner*, 1905.

Graesers Schulausgaben klassischer Werke. v. Kleist, Das Käthchen von Heilbronn oder die Feuerprobe. Herausg. v. A. Lichtenfeld. Körner, Zriny. Herausg. v. Karl Tomanetz. Leipzig, *Teubner*, @ 50 pf.

Gross (Adolf). Die Stichomythie in der griechischen Tragödie u. Komödie, ihre Anwendung u. ihr Ursprung. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1905. 2 m. 80 pf.

Grotenfelt (Arvid). Geschichtliche Wertmassstäbe in der Geschichtsphilosophie. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1905. 5 m.

Hako (The). A Pawnee Ceremony. By Alice C. Fletcher. Assisted by James R. Murie. The Music transcribed by Edwin S. Tracy. Extract from

the Twenty-second annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1904.

Hamilton (George L.) Gower's Use of the Enlarged Roman de Troie. Reprint from Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XX, 1. 'Supercilia Juncta'.—Modern Language Notes, February, 1905.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XV. Published by Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass., 1904.

Hauvette (Amédée). Archiloque, sa vie et ses poésies. Paris, *Albert Fontemoing*, 1905.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. Carl Robert. XL. Bd. 1. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1905.

Hüter (Ludwig). Schüler-Kommentar zu Sophokles' Antigone. geb. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1905. 1 m. 20 pf.

Hussey (George B.) A Handbook of Latin Homonyms. Boston, *Benj. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1905.

Index Isocrateus. Composuit Sigmundus Preuss. Lipsiae, *In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri*. MCMIV. 8 m.

Jäger (Oskar). Homer u. Horaz im Gymnasialunterrichts. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1905. 5 m.

Knauth (H.) Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen in das Lateinische für Abiturienten. I. Teil. Deutscher Text. II. Teil. Lateinischer Text. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1905. 1 m. 50 pf.

Littmann (Enno). A list of Arabic Manuscripts in Princeton University Library. Princeton, N. J., *The University Library*, 1904. 50 c.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita Libri. Ed. A. Zingerle. Pars VII. Fasc. III Lib. XXXIII (Ed. Mai.) Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, 1904. geb. 1 m. 50 pf.

Mallory (Herbert S.) The Poetaster, by Ben Jonson. Ed. with Introduction, Notes and Glossary (Yale Thesis). Yale Studies in English. No. XXVII. Ed. by Albert S. Cook. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1905.

Marr (Bernhard). Die Symbolik der Lunation. Dux, *Schellhauer*, 1905. 2 m. 10 pf.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. Deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik, herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. Achter Jahrg. XV. u. XVI. Bandes. 1. u. 3. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905.

Nohl (Hermann). Schüler-Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede für T. Annii Milo. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1905. 60 pf.

Nutting (H. C.) Studies in the Si-Clause. I. Concessive Si-Clauses in Plautus. II. Subjunctive Protasis with Indicative Apodosis in Plautus. University of California Publications. Classical Philology. Vol. 1. No. 2. Berkeley, *The University Press*, 1905. 60 c.

Oswald (M. M. F.) The Prepositions in Apollonius Rhodius (Cath. U. Dr. Diss.) Notre Dame, Indiana, *University Press*, 1904.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Edited by James A. H. Murray. PAR-GETER-PENNACHED. Vol. VII. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. \$1.90.

Pasciucco (G.) Elagabalos. Contributo agli studi sugli 'Scriptores Historiae Augustae'. Feltre, *Tipografia Panfilo Castaldi*, 1905.

Pope (G. U.) A Handbook of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language. Part II. Key to the Exercises with Notes on Analysis. Seventh ed. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1904. 7s. 6d.

Quellen u. Forschungen zur alten Geschichte u. Geographie. Herausg. v. W. Sieglin. Heft 9: Die geographischen Bücher (II 246-VI Schluss) der Naturalis Historia des C. Plinius Secundus mit vollständigem kritischen Apparat, herausg. v. D. Detlefsen. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1904. 8 m.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von Franz Bücheler, Hermann Usener, August Brinkmann. N. F. LX. 1. Frankfurt, a/M., *Sauerländer*, 1905.

Sachs (Julius). Modern Languages in Secondary Schools (Ed. Review, Feb., 1905).

Schroeder (Otto). Binnenresponion in den Singversen der Griechen. Sonderabdruck aus den N. Jahrb. Jahrg. 1905. 1 Abt. XV. Bd. 2. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.

Schulz (Otto Th.) Leben des Kaisers Hadrian. Quellenanalysen u. historische Untersuchungen. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1904. 4 m.

Semitic Study Series. Ed. by R. J. H. Gottheil and Morris Jastrow. No. IV. A Selection from the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldūn. With Notes and an English-German Glossary. By Duncan B. Macdonald. No. V. The Abu Habba Cylinder of Nabuna (V. Rawlinson Pl. 64). Autographed Text by Robert J. Lau with an Introduction and Glossary in English and German. By J. Dyneley Prince. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*, 1905.

Sihler (Ernest). Amerikanische Bemerkungen zu Weizenfels' Bildungsverwirren der Gegenwart. Sonderabdruck aus d. N. Jahrbüchern, 1905. Jahrg. 1905. II. Abt. XVI. Band. 2. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.

Stimson (Henry A.) The Right Life and How to Live it. New York, *A. S. Barnes & Co.*, 1905. \$1.25.

Tacite. Les Annales. Traduction nouvelle mise au courant des travaux récents de la philologie par L. Loiseau. Préface de J. A. Hild. Paris, *Garnier Frères*, 1905.

Tacitus (P. Cornelius). Erklärt v. Karl Nipperdey. Erster Band. Ab excessu Divi Augusti I-VI. 10 verb. Aufl. Bes. v. Georg Andresen. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1904. 3 m.

Tonks (Oliver Samuel). Brygos, his Characteristics. Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. XIII. No. II. Cambridge, Mass., 1904.

Vendryes (J.) Un petit problème d'accentuation homérique. Extrait des Mélanges de philologie offerts à M. Ferd. Brunot. Paris, *George Bellais*, 1904.

Vergil's Gedichte. Erkl. v. Th. Ladewig u. C. Schaper. III Bdchen. Buch VII-XII der Aeneis. 9. Aufl. Bearb. v. Paul Deuticke. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1904. 2 m. 40 pf.

Vinicius to Nigra. A 4th century Christian letter, discovered at Bath. Deciphered, translated and annotated by E. W. B. Nicholson. With collocation facsimile. London, *Henry Frowde*, 1904. 1s.

Virgilio, Le Bucoliche di. Con introduzione e commento di Ettore Stampieri. Parte Prima. Ecloghe I-V. 3. ed. con molte variazioni ed aggiunte. Torino, *Loescher*, 1905. L. 1. 50.

Vlachos (N. P.) Religious Prophetism among the Greeks. Reprinted from The Reformed Church Review. Vol. IX. Jan., 1905.

Wetmore (M. N.) The Plan and Scope of a Vergil Lexicon. With specimen articles (Yale Ph. D. Thesis). New Haven, Conn., *The Author*, 1904.

Yale Studies in English. Albert S. Cook, Editor. The Staple of News, by Ben Jonson. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary by De Winter (Yale Thesis). New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1905.